

तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

SANTINIKETAN
VISWA BHARATI
LIBRARY

205

G.J.S

Y. 4

THE
JOURNAL
OF THE
GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

EDITED BY
U. N. GHOSHAL

Published by the Greater India Society.

CALCUTTA
1938.

JOURNAL OF THE GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

JANUARY, 1937.

CONTENTS

Articles:	Page
L'art Pseudo-Khmèr au Siam et la <i>Prang</i> ...	1
By Dr. H. Parmentier	
The Tomb of Xuân-lộc (Cochin-China) ...	26
By Dr. E. Gaspardone	
Literary and Epigraphic Notes ...	36
By Mr. Himansu Bhusan Sarkar	
Five Reliefs at Poelo in Tapanoeli (Sumatra) ...	43
By Dr. F. M. Schnitger	
Miscellany:	
Kōl and Muṇḍā: A New Aspect of Austro-Asiatic Problem ...	45
By Dr. J. Przyluski	
Notes:	
The Growth of Western Ideas about India ...	49
By Dr. Hermann Goetz	
Notices of Books ...	66
A. H. Longhurst , <i>The Story of the Stūpa</i> (J. N. Banerjea); F. M. Schnitger , <i>Oudheidkundige Vondsten in Padang Lawas; Hindoe-Oudheden aan de Batang Hari; Oudheidkundige in Palembang</i> ; H. G. Eggink , <i>Angkola-en Mandailing-Batakasch-Nederlandsch Woordenboek</i> ; J. Conda , <i>Het Oudjavaansche Bhīṣmaparwa</i> (H. B. Sarkar); G. C. Mendis , <i>The Early History of Ceylon</i> (C. C. Dasgupta)	
Books Received ...	77

THE
JOURNAL
OF THE
GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

VOL. IV

JANUARY, 1937

No. 1

L'art Pseudo-Khmèr au Siam et la *Prang**

By Dr. H. Parmentier

[English *résumé* by Dr. Batakrishna Ghosh]

The date of a structure can be determined in two independent ways: by utilising the texts, particularly the inscriptions on the monuments themselves; and by studying all the architectural and decorative elements assigning every monument to an evolutionary series of which certain points are accurately datable.

These two methods should lend mutual support to each other, as they are rarely able separately to furnish a dependable criterion. Moreover, reshuffling of old structures has been quite frequent. An architectural study of Siamese monuments resulting in greater precision regarding the relevant facts can therefore largely help the determination of the age of these edifices.

* This important article, which throws new light on the early history of Siamese architecture, is printed in the original French, as a translation would fail to do justice to the technicalities and complex arguments with which it abounds. An English *résumé* is added for those who are not in a position to read the original French.—Editor, *JGIS*.

It is commonly held that a certain number of Siamese edifices in stone are of Khmèr inspiration. The result is that the Siamese *prang* is considered to be the normal sequence of the Khmèr *pràsàt*. This theory is true only to a partial extent.

The monuments of Siam which may be approached from the point of view of Khmèr art, fall into two groups: the first group consists of a small number of edifices, clearly Khmèr, as can be inferred from the material employed as also from the technique of execution. In these monuments are found sand-stone and brick used without any perceptible mortar, and the decorations are chiselled on the sand-stone of the main structure or on the blocks placed in the middle of the brickwork. Judging by their form and inscriptions, they can be placed in the 11th and the 12th centuries,—an epoch when Siam was a Khmèr province. This group, of which the origin is certain, consists of five monuments,—P'ymai 447, Nom Văn 437, the Phnom Ruñ 401, Mu'ang yăm 404, and the Pr. Ban Si.

The second group consisting of isolated towers or of frontal groups of three, which most often formed the centre of immense *Wāts*, are of less transparent style. This type is represented by seventeen monuments. If their massiveness suggests Khmèr influence, their construction in laterite or in brick joined with mortar differentiates them from the art of Cambodia, from which their decoration, obtained solely by the applications of plaster, is clearly different.

From a detailed study of the architecture of this group, it is possible to distinguish therein seven monuments of truly Khmèr origin, characterized by their mode of construction which is different from that of Siam, although modified in their external aspect by the use of plaster. They are the Wat Sán P'ă Sùà Mùóng and the W. P'ă P'ai Luóng of Sūkhôt'ăi, the W. Sán P'ă Kan, the W. Nak'on Kōsá, the W. Deva Sathan Pran

and the W. Prang Sám Yô't of Lăp'buri, the W. Kham Pam Leng of P'ec'aburi. Their forms are not characteristic enough to permit their dating with precision. All that can be said is that the first five—and particularly the second—appear to be anterior to the royal buildings of Cambodia: they should have therefore been erected during the first period of Khmèr domination. The last two temples might be of later origin and date from the end of the 12th century or from even 13th century.

The ten other monuments of this group should be regarded as pseudo-Khmèr. Their possible dates range from the 11th century to the beginning of the 13th. If they are compared with the Cambodian monuments of this epoch, some resemblance truly comes to light, but it is vague, and it is not only the plaster which differentiates them, but also the whole process of construction.

The Khmèrs utilised brick at a time when they were not yet past masters in the use of sand-stone. It reigns supreme in the biggest temples. It is accompanied by the plaster, but ceases to be utilised from the end of the 10th century. When the sand-stone begins to form the body of the biggest monuments—in the 11th century and in the first half of the 12th—the brick has no more than a partial utility. Afterwards it disappears completely.

In the Siamese monuments which we are considering none of these features can be seen, nor the characteristic disposition of the Cambodian art of this epoch: the enclosure of galleries, composition of halls and vestibules in three naves which are mostly false, the triumph of sculpture which becomes a constituent part of architecture, and the common use of false windows. Nothing of all this can be found in Siam where the brick joined by an apparent mortar is in common use, and the laterite (utilised sometimes in enormous masses in Cambodia) is cut into the form and volume of a big brick.

The countries of the Far East that were influenced by the Indian civilisation other than Siam present a clear

picture of artistic evolution. One can observe there the Indian culture installing itself and expanding into a new original art by absorbing the local tendencies, and finally effacing itself before the triumph of the latter. Then the architecture ceases to employ any more durable materials and returns to the lighter indigenous construction in which only the persistence of some motifs indicates the past existence of a long foreign influence. This is the history of Java, Burma, Campā and Cambodia. In Siam there is found at no period an original and homogeneous art, and the statuary, which offers the clearest tableau, shows series of successive schools which are almost independent of each other. In architecture too this strange variety is to be found. The light *Vihāra* of India in superimposed storeys, for instance, has been transformed in the Far East into a series of distinct types: in Java the lowest storey becomes preponderant and the other storeys are reduced and are covered by the *stūpa*; in Campā and in Cambodia the whole complex assumes the aspect of a pyramid more or less slim, whereas in China, Japan and Tonkin (Binh-són, *BE.*, XXXIII, pl. XXXIII) the storeys retain the same dimensions and form the classical "pagoda." Now all these types, separate in other countries, are united in Siam.

From the variety of structural models met with in Siam, and from the strangeness of certain decorative motifs on the plaster, it may be inferred that the country received a series of distinct art-tradition from a common source. Moreover, we have to take into account the constant use of light structures by the side of exceptional edifices in durable masonry. From this the evolution of Siamese art, said to be Khmèr, and the birth of the *prang* are explicable by the following hypothesis:

The Cambodians at the time of their domination over Siam constructed a whole series of monuments of which only a small number, made of durable material, have come down to us. P'itimai is the type of these monuments.

From the end of the 10th to that of the 13th century this model is also found in Cambodia. There also the *pràsàt* is regularly preceded by a big hall of masonry imitating an edifice with three naves. Very often the lateral and the posterior doors of the tower do not, as before, give access to the sanctuary, but are protected by a graceful contrivance (a porch before which the door, still genuine, is repeated again), while in the principal axis a fourth porch joins the sanctuary with the anterior hall.

If we now turn towards the specimen of pseudo-Khmèr edifices which are most intact and least Siamised, we shall find a schematisation of this type which is quite advanced but still distinctly recognisable. This is particularly the case with the central *prang* of W. Măhátha'at of Lōp'buri and of the ruined edifice of Čuḷamăṇi.

Of all that has been erected in Siam in light structure nothing has been preserved, and the earliest stages of evolution which are accessible to us are the translations in laterite which the Siamese set up by replacing the framework of wood with durable materials set on Burmese mortar. From that time the structures continue to exist to the present age and their evolution becomes quite clear.

Čuḷamăṇi tends to lose its windows of the porch of the nave, Raj Bunah and P'utth'aisăvăn have no longer any vestibule and the lateral doors of the nave become false; they are no longer present in the *prang* of the W. Măháth'at of Săvăn'ălōk and it is not at all to be seen before that of P'iṣṇūlōk¹. The transformation of the *pràsàt* into *prang* seems to have gone hand in hand with the transformations of the anterior hall. The first group still clearly reveals the arris of the square of false bays; the edifice is only slightly too stretched to be regarded as an ordinary *pràsàt*. The third and the fourth already tend to sink the arris of the square by reducing the false bays and lose even the lotuses above; the fifth has no longer any false bays and replaces each of them by an enormous ornament; the sixth still bears traces of a vague souvenir

of the false bays, but the principal arris becomes lesser still and is completely effaced in the last. The terminal part with lotus which is perceptible at the beginning is rapidly lost, the number of stages passes from five to seven or more and the ornaments are lengthened and grow more important although at the same time they are simplified, and those on high are reversed back, joining the whole mass to the continued curve which is pierced only by the final *Navaśūla*.

The constructions which we admit to be Khmèr can be placed in all likelihood near about the 12th century, in rare cases like the Pr. Ban Si, still earlier; it is hardly likely that they are appreciably posterior in time. We have some dates which may be used for the rest with the above reservations; they seem to fit quite well with the evolution suggested above. Čuḷamāñi dates from the reign of King Paramatrāilokanātha, *i. e.*, from the middle of the 15th century, the *prang* of P'isṇulôk of the year 1482 dates from the end of the same century. If these two dates have to be admitted, one would have to conclude that the evolution which was slow at first was rapid towards the end as is quite often the case. Therefore the *prang* of Löp'buri which seems to predate Čuḷamāñi should doubtless have preceded it by a very short margin; to assign it to the beginning of the 15th century would be to attribute to it the highest possible antiquity.

Thus the transformation of the initial Khmèr structures of light construction, which had required nearly two hundred years to reach the type of Löp'buri, was completed afterwards in less than a century and resulted almost in the perfected *prang*. But there is nothing impossible in it.

We have thus disengaged at the side of a mixed and light T'āi architecture of the best construction which is highly interesting and connected with Cambodia and Burma, but still quite distinct, a robust and purely Siamese art which like all these arts of the extreme orient had been

only the starting point of a new departure, less distant than those of the other arts of these countries but still persisting through several centuries: it had realised an entirely new form, the *prang*, at a time when the most glorious art traditions of the Far East dozed into decadence or death.

L'art pseudo-khmér au Siam et le *prang*.

. par

H. Parmentier

*Architecte diplômé par le Gouvernement
Chef honoraire du Service Archéologique de l'Ecole
Française d'Extrême-Orient*

C'est une opinion courante, acceptée sans discussion, qu'un certain nombre d'édifices siamois en maçonnerie sont d'inspiration khmère. On n'hésite pas alors à dire comme mon confrère J. Y. Claeys dans son excellent article sur l'Archéologie du Siam (*BE.* XXXI 369)¹ que les monuments de Lōp'bŭri, P'isnŭlōk et Sŭkhót'āi (p. 369) datent du X^e au XIII^e siècles et l'on voit même un maître, comme M. G. Coedès, arbitre incontesté de tout ce qui se rapporte à l'histoire et à l'archéologie du Siam, déclarer, à la seule lecture des textes, que la grande tour du Wāt Mähāth'āt de Lōp'buri appartient au règne de Sŭryavarman I, roi du Cambodge au XI^e siècle et vainqueur du Siam. Mais seuls les textes sont consultés alors, aucune vérification architecturale de l'édifice n'accompagne la datation, et nous savons par la cruelle méprise d'Aymonier sur la date du Bāyon, rectifiée par MM. Stern et le même G. Coedès, combien sont dangereuses ces interprétations unilatérales. Il en résulte que le *prang* est considéré sans discussion comme l'aboutissement normal du *prāsāt*

1. Nous citerons cet article ici par les letters Cl.; d'autres renvoient à l'article de M. Coedès *Documents sur l'histoire politique et religieuse du Laos occidental BE.*, XXV, p. 1, et. sqq. par la l'abréviation Doc.; enfin le *Siam ancien* de Fournereau par la letters F, le numéro du tome et le numéro de la planche.

khmèr. L'idée est vraie pour une part, mais pour une part seulement: elle demande à être serrée de plus près, et au premier examen de telles difficultés se présentent qu'on serait d'abord tenté de l'écarter.

Les monuments au Siam qui peuvent être rapprochés de l'art khmèr sont de deux sortes: les uns, en petit nombre et qui se rencontrent surtout parmi les grands ensembles, sont nettement khmèrs. Ils sont caractérisés par leurs matériaux et leur construction, grès ou briques, montés par assises sans mortier, au moins apparent pour la brique et par la forme de leurs décors ciselés dans le grès de la masse ou dans des blocs rapportés au milieu de la maçonnerie de briques. L'époque la plus ancienne à laquelle leur forme et leurs inscriptions permettent de les faire remonter est le XI^e ou le XII^e siècle; à cette date le Siam est devenue une province khmère que le maître embellit de ses temples. L'aspect de ces édifices ne trompe pas et nul n'hésite sur leur origine. Ils se réduisent à un petit nombre parmi ceux signalés par L. de Lajonquière et le Ct. Seidenfaden: ce sont P'ymai **447**, Nom Vān **437**, le Phnom Ruñ **401**, Mu'ang Tām **404**, le Pr. Ban Si (*BE.* XXII 68) plus ancien, les premiers généralement en grès, le dernier en briques.

Une série d'autres, en tours uniques ou par front de trois, formant le centre de *wāt* considérables le plus souvent, sont d'allure moins franche et, si leur masse éveille un souvenir khmèr, leur construction en latérite ou en briques à joints de mortier les différencie de l'art du Cambodge et leurs décors, d'un caractère spécial, obtenus seulement par l'application d'enduits, les opposent souvent aux conceptions khmères.

Avant de tenter de résoudre l'antinomie de leur silhouette d'une part et d'une forte série de leurs décors de l'autre, nous allons d'abord passer en revue tous les édifices qui évoquent une impression khmère. Quel ordre adopterons nous? En ces matières le plus raisonnable paraît être l'ordre de datation, et les renseignements fournis par

les chroniques et les inscriptions sont assez nombreux pour que l'époque de la fondation de nombreux *wāt* soit connue. Mais ici, plus qu'au Cambodge, le renseignement historique est fallacieux. En ce pays de conservatisme, le document peut juste être appliqué à la masse même de l'édifice et son aspect extérieur, qui pour une bonne part résulte du décor, peut provenir de la centième restauration, celle d'hier : l'inconvénient de l'enduit pour l'archéologue c'est que son appliaction si aisée en fait une simple mesure d'entretien guère plus importante qu'un ravalement. Réduits à leur masse, les monuments khmèrs se ressemblent fort et quand pour de telles bâtisses on est obligé de mettre à part la construction dans laquelle l'architecte cherchera les marques de l'évolution ou la forme extérieure que l'historien d'art examinera plutôt, il ne reste pas grand chose ; rien ne vient alors appuyer l'indication de l'historien. Ici heureusement, mieux qu'au Cambodge, la masse même de l'édifice donne une indication précieuse et comme le *prang* est marqué postérieur puis que son édification est encore courante, on pourrait chercher une indication dans la transformation du *pràsāt* en *prang*, mais les exemples sont trop peu nombreux dans les grands édifices pour s'attacher à ce fil conducteur et ce serait d'ailleurs un peu considérer d'avance le problème comme résolu.

Nous allons donc adopter un ordre brutal, du Nord au Sud, celui de notre voyage en 1931 et nous passerons la revue des édifices douteux dans l'ordre même où nous les avons vus. nous examinerons ensuite les deux ou trois tours où l'évolution du *prang* est nettement terminée et qu'on n'est plus tenté d'appeler autrement que siamoises.

Le premier édifice d'esprit khmèr que nous avons rencontré, d'époque sans doute assez basse, n'a cependant absolument rien du *prang*. C'est une gracieuse construction rajoutée devant la porte postérieure de la première des deux salles qui s'allongent à l'Est devant le grand *stūpa* orienté du W. Suon Dōk à C'ieng Māi



Pl. I A—Vue de l'édifice rajouté
au Vihari de Suon Dōk

(fg. 1^{re} I pl. 1 A). Si les arêtes ne présentaient pas la courbe concave classique de l'art t'hai et ses fins décors de pas-




Fig. 1




Fig. 2

tillages, et si sa porte n'était si longue, on prendrait ce bâtiment pour un petit *pràsàt* khmér, d'époque un peu vague, dont il ne resterait que le soubassement, le corps et le premier étage des superstructures. C'est une construction de briques assemblées au mortier et dont tout le décor est demandé à l'enduit. Sur un haut soubassement détaillé

2. Ces figures sont des croquis et non des relevés et les échelles ne sont qu'approximatives.

3. J'unis sous ce terme les arts, voisins de formes, du Laos français et du Siam qui sans être identiques ont beaucoup d'éléments communs; cependant rien, absolument rien au Laos ne rappelle le *prang* siamois,

Le corps carré redenté s'élève entre base et corniche et offre sur chaque face visible une fausse porte double en plan. La corniche, assez simple (fg. 2), porte un terrasson en doucine; sur celui-ci un bahut forme soubassement à un étage de même composition couvert d'un nouveau terrasson et les restes s'arrêtent là. Devant le redent du corps principal, la fausse porte participe de la base commune et sur une corniche analogue ses pilastres de premier plan reçoivent un arc ogival d'esprit absolument khmèr; l'arc offre en bas une crosse de pur décor mais dans la silhouette du *makara* à trompe levée ou du motif de *nāga* sortant d'une tête de lion qui l'a remplacé. Le second plan soutient plus haut un autre fronton analogue dont la crosse finale ne présente qu'une tête assez courte de monstre sans qu'on puisse savoir si le motif n'a pas perdu sa terminaison. Par contre l'arc enferme un tympan de pâtisserie au dessus de vantaux à rinceaux géométriques que sépare un battement triangulaire, tous décors qui n'ont rien de khmèr. La fausse-baie à l'étage semble à simple plan. Une sorte d'arc comme l'antique *kūdu* orne la terrasse au dessus.

La pagode passe pour avoir été installée en 1371 dans une ville fondée en 1296 et le pavillon en question n'est pas de la première heure, puisqu'il est nettement rajouté à cette salle dont il modifie les dispositions occidentales. Le mettre du début du XIV^e siècle est la plus haute antiquité qu'on puisse lui attribuer et je la crains fort exagérée.


Avec les tours du W. Sisāvái 470⁴ de Sukhot'āi, nous sommes en présence de constructions d'esprit moins khmèr et plus voisines du *prang*. Ce sont des tours⁵ de latérite

4. Le monument a été plus ou moins dégagé depuis le passage de L. de Lajonquière qui indique les tours latérales comme murées et ne mentionne pas de crypte. Par contre il signale à terre devant la porte de la tour centrale un linteau de grès très effacé qui pourrai avoir constitué une naissance de Brahma.

5. Voir F. I. pl. LXXXIII.



Pl. II A—Tours de Sisavi à
Sūkhōtāi.



Pl. II B—Tours du W. Māhāthāt d'Āyūth'ia

et de briques dont le décor assez simple est demandé au revêtement d'enduit. Ces tours ouvertes au Sud forment un front E.-O.; elles sont carrées avec un système bâtard de fausses-portes et de redents aux angles. Elles présentent deux salles superposées, petites et l'une est traitée en crypte où l'on descend. Il semble que les escaliers d'accès à la porte S. de la salle supérieure partent latéralement de celui qui descend à la crypte. A l'extérieur les tours ont un corps principal assez bas, carré, redenté, à trois saillies au coin entre celles des fausses-portes qui amènent à 5 le nombre des arêtes par angle. La base est commune à la tour et aux fausses-portes et la hauteur de celles-ci est très faible: ainsi la partie nue du pilastre a juste sa largeur dans sa hauteur (pl. II A). Leurs frontons font un simple carré nu aux tours latérales et Fournereau nous apprend que cette maigre hauteur correspond à celle de la cellule supérieure. Au dessus de cette surface carrée court un large bandeau qui se profile sur les cinq arêtes de l'angle. Il forme toute la corniche, car sur les redents une paroi nue de la hauteur d'un étage courant pose sur une lourde doucine qui l'avance sur le redent et l'amène à la saillie de la paroi au dessus de la fausse-porte.

Sur ce bandeau six ou sept étages égaux et peu importants offrent sur chaque coin cinq arêtes que garnit une antéfixe souvent très riche: orant, *tévodâ* ou *garuḍa*. Dans la partie qui continue la fausse-porte et qui correspond à son seul fronton, qui s'étend sur toute la largeur, forme intermédiaire entre l'arc en U renversé et l'ogive; il est légèrement lobé et son rampant mouluré est terminé par une tête de *makara* ou de crocodile d'où sort un *nāga* triple franchement crêté. De rares arcs de fausses-baie enferment une image de *buddha* assis. Fournereau (t. I, p. 311) dit que ces étages sont terminés par une moulure circulaire soutenant une rangée de lotus avec un bouton en couronnement. Ne pas partager l'admiration de mon ami Claeys (Cl. p. 420) pour ce monument aux lourdes pro-

portions, au decor pauvre et inégal,—il est peu probable que ces edifices soient anterieurs à la ville, et la ville à la fondation du royaume de Sukhôt'xi, c'est à dire du milieu du XIII^e siècle et c'est, je crois, risquer déjà de vieillir cet ensemble que de le placer même à la fin du XIII^e siècle.

Dans la même ville, le W. Sán P'rá Sua Muong est près de l'art khmèr, mais son enseignement est faible, car il est resté en épannelage; il est orienté exactement. C'est un édifice du genre d'un *pràsàt* khmèr, en carré redenté, avec fausses-portes à deux plans et vestibule à l'Est. L'intérieur est rendu inaccessible par l'amoncellement des décombres. La porte orientale n'a pas conservé trace de ses colonnettes. La tour s'élève sur un soubassement à grand profil à doucines et bague double. Il est construit en grands blocs de latérite qui portent les trous ronds habituels au grès et les fausses-portes ont gardé les creux des poutres en doublure, ce qui semblerait indiquer une ancienneté relative et pourrait peut-être le faire classer dans la série vraiment khmère; ses formes en ce cas le feraient croire antérieur à la dernière période de l'art du Cambodge.

Il en est de même des trois tours du W. P'rá P'ai Luóng de la même ville dont la tour S. seule s'est conservée⁶. L'intérieur est en carré redenté avec quatre niches importantes. Une corniche, à la base des arcs, a porté un plafond. La première base du piédestal paraît encore en place. La porte a un ébrasement normal; ses montants sont faits par assises de latérite avec gros joints de mortier, mais dans le haut seulement, et il est probable que c'est là seulement une reprise postérieure. Au dehors, la tour comporte un soubassement saillant, puis un corps à redents et des fausses-portes à colonnettes par tambours; les linteaux ont disparu; les faux-vantaux ont le battement ordinaire, mais


6. Coedès, *Ars Asiatica*, XII, p. 28, 2; Cl. pl. LXXV D,

d'une forme lourde. Le fronton pose sur une bande de décors; les pilastres ont un profil de corniche khmèr habituel. L'arc en ogive ondulée montre des saillants en losange. A l'ouest il encadre une scène bouddhique d'enduit; les colonnettes en stuc grossier paraissent la traduction saillants en losanges. Le redent de la tour se fond avec l'arrière re-corps de la porte qui possède un fronton classique du même type. La corniche qui porte ce fronton fait ceinture à la tour et vient couper sa proportion. La corniche réelle est du type khmèr courant; elle se profile et contreprofile sur le vrai redent échappé du fronton précédent. Elle porte un bahut garni d'antéfixes dont la principale d'angle est un motif de *nāga*. Puis viennent trois étages redentés avec bahut, fausse-baie, et antéfixes; l'une plus importante occupe le centre de la fausse baie. Il y a lieu d'observer que la partie du corps séparée du reste par la corniche en ceinture de la fausse-porte est traitée dans un esprit spécial par le fait que cette corniche soutient une petite base pour cette section du corps et que les trois étages de la tour montent en se réduisant en continuant la proportion de ce faux-étage. Un quatrième vient s'interposer sous le couronnement de lotus. Le fronton O. est occupé par une scène bouddhique⁷ d'enduit; les colonnettes en stuc grossier paraissent la traduction de pièces à cinq éléments. Le redent de la tour se fond couronnement de lotus. Tout cet art, bien que traité en enduit et par suite sans grande ancienneté, se rapproche bien plus de l'art antérieur que du style du Bàyon; on y voit d'ailleurs encore des pots très en doublure, qui sont totalement disparues à cette dernière époque.

7. L'hypothèse de notre ami Claeys p. 417, sur la primitive destination brahmanique de ce temple ne s'impose pas; elle est fondée seulement, je crois, sur la présence d'Indra et d'Airāvata dans un autre fronton. Or il n'y a nulle atinomie entre ce motif et l'art bouddhique et il est commun dans les pagodes du Siam et du Cambodge moderne.

Avec les tours de briques du W. Mäháth'át d'Ayúth'ia nous retombons dans le pseudo-khmèr. Dans ce monument qui passe pour avoir été élevé par le roi P'rā Rameseram, 2° ou 3° roi de la dynastie d'Āyúth'ia, soit au XIV^e siècle deux édifices accompagnent la masse centrale ruinée, tours qui semblent intermédiaires entre le *pràsàt* et le *prang* : elles ont du *pràsàt* la terminaison circulaire de lotus, bien nette sur celle de l'angle S.-E. ; elles ont du *prang* le peu de hauteur du corps principal et la multiplication des étages qui sont au nombre de 7 au moins, compris celui-ci ; il en est de même de l'importance attribuée à l'antéfixe d'axe, tandis que la fausse-baie est réduite à un arc ondule de la hauteur de chaque corniche ; il tient tout le redent central et vient se serrer derrière l'antéfixe de face entre les deux d'angle correspondantes (pl. II B, édifices de droite).

Le Raj Bunah d'Āyúth'ia nous rapproche du *prang*, mais aussi d'autres édifices d'un caractère particulier que nous verrons plus au Sud et qui nous mettront plus près de l'origine khmère. C'est la bâtiment central d'un *wát* important allongé au Nord du W. Mäháth'át et ouvert dans le même sens, c'est à dire à l'Est. La tour centrale se présente encore dans le système intermédiaire entre le *pràsàt* et le *prang*. L'édifice, en moellons de latérite à joints de mortier et décors d'enduit porte sur trois soubassements inégaux formant une hauteur importante. Il est précédé d'un avant-corps qui perd un soubassement. Sur le corps principal redenté s'élève une corniche au dessus d'une frise de guirlandes pendantes arrêtée. Cette corniche s'orne de statues debout placées comme des gardiens de temple et aux angles sont d'énormes *garuḍa*. On voit ainsi 7 étages, compris le corps principal. Celui-ci offre des fausses-portes à double corps ; elles ont une fine base et des frises opposées et encadrent un *buddha* debout. Au dessus le fronton de la fausse-porte dépasse la corniche et arrive sur celle de l'étage suivant. La fausse-baie principale, au dessus des figures debout a son encadrement en



Pl. I B. -Prang du Raj-Bunah d'Âyüthia

accolade retroussé par deux belles crosses. Le couronnement de lotus laisse encore un souvenir franc. L'avant-corps, entre base et corniche à frises a des fausses-portes à deux plans et du même esprit que celles de la tour. Sur cette mince nef, la corniche principale a porté des lions et des *garuḍa* d'angle. Son étage simple ou double soutient une croisée de voûtes-toits sur laquelle s'élève un *stūpa* en cloche. Détail bien t'ai, les diverses arêtes verticales sont concaves (pl. IB).

L'édifice suivant forme le centre du W. P'ūtth'aisā'vān pagode importante d'Ayūth'ia encore dont Fournereau a donné le plan dans le tome II de son Siam ancien pl. XLIV sous le nom réduit de Vat Phū Tai. Il y fournit du sanctuaire principal, tour et avant-corps, un plan précis.⁸ Le bâtiment est plutôt un *prang*; il présente une salle intérieure, étroite chambre qui contient un remarquable *stūpa* à corps redenté et soubassement important, bahut et cloche avec haute pointe. Deux fenêtres dans les murs N. et S. éclairent cet intérieur. On y arrive par un long couloir sous plafond qui vient de la salle de la nef antérieure. Celle-ci contient diverses pièces siamoises sous un plafond rouge et or. Le *prang* a des fausses-portes; celle de l'Ouest seule est munie d'un perron; elle est plus basse de soubassement et est sensiblement plus saillante que les autres; elle a cinq frontons successifs. La baie de l'Est est précédée par l'avant-corps, important, très allongé; il n'a que deux soubassements et plus petits que ceux de la tour. Il est accompagné par deux fausses-portes: plus exactement, le premier corps vers l'extérieur est une fausse entrée; celui d'arrière est un bras de croix peu saillant sous pignon de la voûte courbe. Celle-ci est conçue en surface ondulée

8. Il indique des cellules avec un *bouddha* derrière les portes que j'ai notées comme fausses; je n'ai rien vu de semblable et la disposition paraît encore plus anormale à l'avant-corps; cette correction est garantie par le fait que la même erreur se repète pour l'exemple suivant dont j'ai pris un plan détaillé.

avec fausses-tuiles rondes. Les pignons ont des rampants en ogive ondulée. Le *prang* comporte 7 étages ornés d'antéfixes au dessus de son corps et le septième a ses antéfixes couchées; c'est le simple bahut de séparation, ramené dans le plan de la courbure générale qui remplace le couronnement de lotus. Le monument, d'après Claeys p. 397 aurait été construit en 1353; mais le vestibule et l'avant-corps auraient été refaits.

A Lõp 'bũi, la tour centrale du W. P'ră Śrī Ratna Măhăth'at,⁹ pagode principale et importante de la ville, est accompagnée de deux tours de briques nettement




Fig. 3

postérieures. L'édifice (fig. 3), de latérite et d'enduit, est bien moins avancé dans l'évolution vers le *prang*.¹⁰ C'est une tour exactement orientée en carré redenté à fausses-portes précédée d'une salle antérieure qu'accompagne un vestibule. Au dedans, la tour contient une cella à trois grandes niches. En avant la salle est munie de

9. Fournereau a donné le plan de cet ensemble dans la pl. XLIII du t. II sous le nom de Vat Na Phra That avec deux tours seulement, car la troisième (Cl. p. 399) n'a été trouvée qu'après sa visite. Il répète la même erreur des cellules à *buddha* derrière les fausses-portes.

10. Cl. pi. LV vue du Sud, LVI du Sud-Est et LVII.

portes au Nord et au Sud et ces portes sont plus éloignées de la tour que de l'entrée. Celle-ci est constituée par un vestibule ouvert par une porte et éclairé latéralement par des baies très étroites, de véritables meurtrières. Au dehors la partie principale se présente comme une tour carrée à trois fausses-portes avec 7 redents par angle E., 9 par angle O., les fausses-portes comptant pour quatre. La paroi est garnie d'une grande frise à guirlandes pendantes arrêtée et contrefrise de même entre base à deucine et corniche semblable avec bahut. La fausse-porte est à deux plans et sa base est bien plus petite que celle de la tour. Sa corniche de pilastre règne sur les deux corps, bien que le fronton postérieur ait un autre départ beaucoup plus élevé. Les frontons sont à minces rampants ondulés et se terminent de chaque côté par une grosse tête de *makara* d'où s'épanouit un motif de *nāga* dont les têtes sont entourés par un arc multilobé. Le second fronton de la porte S. domine avec un groupe de Buddha attestant la terre entre deux fidèles, sur sa face E. le muret montre une niche avec un *buddha* dans le même acte.

La petite nef antérieure est à deux étages avec au corps inférieur petite frise à guirlandes pendantes et très grande contrefrise. Sur la corniche sont des abouts de fausses-tuiles ornées de têtes; le muret présente une série de niches et une nouvelle corniche. Les deux plans de la porte latérale sont traités comme à la tour avec le même défaut d'arrangement en arrière. La porte N. a son linteau remplacé par une pièce de bois et un motif de stuc. Les deux plans de la porte latérale sont traités comme à la tour avec le même défaut d'arrangement en arrière. La porte N. a son linteau remplacé par une pièce de bois et un motif de stuc. La voûte de la nef se détache d'un fronton encadré d'un rampant dont les *nāga* sortent d'une tête de *makara* issant de la tour. La porte d'entrée de l'ensemble, porte du porche oriental, a un linteau de pierre du type II avec motif triple: lions et personnages dansant ou combattant.

L'arrangement des bases n'est plus compris : la base de la fausse-porte S. est plus haute que celle de la nef jusqu'à la tour tandis qu'elle est commune avec celle du porche. A la place où devrait se trouver une grande doucine est une sorte de cavet garni d'oiseaux passant.

Les étages de la tour, au nombre de quatre, comprennent le même nombre d'arêtes, des fausses-baies au lieu des fausses-portes et toutes antéfixes. Le cinquième étage garde la forme circulaire à lotus et des parties de couronnement sont tombées à terre dans l'angle Sud-Est.

Tout l'ensemble est soutenu par un groupe de soubassement d'une hauteur considérable. Le premier, en haut et le suivant sont coupés par des perrons au droit de chaque baie vraie ou fausse. Un troisième plus important n'a d'escalier que sous les portes principales. Ces divers gradins sont du vieux profil à doucines autour d'une bague profil, à doucines autour d'une bague double.

Aux tours latérales de briques, le dedans ne présente rien de spécial ; la voûte en cheminée offre l'évent circulaire cambodgien. Une corniche intérieure en doucine est exécutée en laterite. Le plafond siamois est placé beaucoup plus haut. Au dehors elles ont un corps droit à fausses-portes avec à l'Est avant-corps important. Le corps central porte quatre étages et au dessus une ruine informe. La voûte de l'avant-corps est constituée en ogive par assises horizontales. Le soubassement est traité comme le précédent.

Les monuments du même point qui nous restent à examiner ne nous retiendront guère. L'un, le W. Sán P'rá Kan, le San Sung 467 de Lajonquière est une suite de terrasses avec des sculptures khmères, en semble anormal qui ne nous apprend rien ; l'autre, le W. Nak 'on Kōśá 468, plus au Nord, est une gracieuse tour en briques au corps simple, avec fausses-portes à double plan et double étage, décors d'enduit et antéfixes qui paraissent de pierre. La petite tour a été construite par Chat Pya Kōśá sous le règne de P'rá Narai par suite au XVII^e



Pl. IV A.-- Edifice de Culaamāni à
P'isnūlik: Coté du porche

siècle, dans l'esprit d'une tour khmère. Je ne sais ce que vaut la tradition et s'il ne s'agit pas plutôt d'un rhabillage d'un édifice plus ancien. De toute façon, le petit bâtiment ne semble pas apporter de données nouvelles. Le troisième, le W. Deva Sathan Prang 465, le W. P'rā Prang Khêk de Claeys p. 400 est un groupe de trois tours orientées E. 10° S., précédé par une salle siamoise à deux pignons. Ces tours sont en briques. La tour centrale offre à l'intérieur un curieux décor d'arcatures qui laisse chaque fois un vide au milieu. Le plafond est placé beaucoup plus haut que ce décor. L'autel est encore en place, mais la cuve à ablutions est renversée. La porte dont le piédroit était assemblé d'onglet a été réparée et couverte par des linteaux de bois. La tour N. a conservé son cadre ancien assemblé d'onglet, mais les montants sont construits par assises. L'intérieure possède une corniche. La tour est précédée d'un avant-corps. Les fausses-portes ont un panneau carré au dessus de l'ogive du fronton; elles ont des battements à saillants. Au dessus du corps de la tour sont cinq étages normaux; un sixième en lotus est particulièrement reconnaissable à la tour N. et sur un débris tombé à terre. Il n'y a plus trace du soubassement général qui cependant devait unir les trois tours. La construction est faite par assemblage de briques sans mortier. Lajonquière n'hésite pas à voir là un bâtiment khmèr complété par des additions siamoises et cette opinion me paraît très vraisemblable. Mais la datation de ce groupe est des plus difficile par manque de décors caractéristiques et leur remplacement possible par des enduits siamois à cette heure indatables.

Le problème est plus simple pour le quatrième monument, le W. Prang Sâm Yôt 446 (Cl. pl. LVIII). Ce sont trois tours unies ensemble, d'origine nettement khmère, orientées à l'Est avec un léger écart vers le Sud. La tour centrale a quatre baies, les baies d'axe E.-O. précédées d'un vestibule, celles d'axe N.-S. unies par un bout de galerie minuscule. La salle intérieure de la tour centrale

assez spacieuse construite en latérite forme croisée avec larges arêtes creuses. Les portes sont assemblées d'équerre. Un plafond rouge et or a été installé par les Siamois sur la vieille corniche intérieure. Les portes opposées de la galerie ont colonnettes et cadres, mais les linteaux sont bruts. La porte N. extrême est abritée sous un vestibule traité de même. Les colonnettes monolithes octogonales engagées ont 5 motifs gracieusement exécutés. Une poutre à crapaudines passe derrière le linteau et ne soutient rien. Le linteau vrai lui-même est déchargé suivant la dernière méthode khmère. La porte S. de la tour centrale a des ascètes sur les dés de ses colonnettes. La voûte de la tour S., visible à travers le plafond disloqué, est normale.

A l'extérieur, les tours se présentent en carrés simples précédés sur chaque face par un avant-corps d'où part le vestibule ou la galerie de jonction. Les trois saillies de la tour centrale sont en outre accompagnées de deux basses-nefs fausses. Le corps montre une frise et une contrefrise d'enduit, il est coupé par des corniches intermédiaires partant des fausses-portes. Au dessus s'élèvent quatre étages redentés garnis de fausses-baies et d'antéfixes et deux étages au moins de couronnement circulaire. Frontons et antéfixes sont du type habituel. Le fronton central de la face O. à la tour du milieu montre les mortaises d'une nef légère à laquelle correspond une terrasse de latérite. La crête de la galerie est garnie de niches ogivales; un *Buddha* y est reconnaissable au vestibule méridional de la tour Sud. La galerie N. montre sur sa face O. une fenêtre encadrée de pilastres et d'un fronton. Les vestibules ont eu des fenêtres. L'ensemble des tours est remonté sur un soubassement commun à doucine et bande. Ces édifices n'ont rien du *prang* et leur caractère khmèr n'est pas douteux, au moins comme première fondation.

Čuḷamāṇi de P'isṇulôk, en briques, est par malheur ruiné jusqu'à mi-corps. L'élément principal au fond du



Pl. IV B.—Edifice de Culamani à Pişpûlök
Partie de fausseporte

terrain, est une tour carrée redentée précédée à l'Est par une petite nef munie de deux portes sur l'axe N.-S. et d'une porte à l'Est. L'ensemble est construit en latérite de petit échantillon. Claeys en donne plan et façades dans ses figures 50, 51, pl. LXV, détail fg. 52, photos d'ensemble pl. LXVI et de détails pl. LXVII et les renseignements qu'il fournit dans son texte p. 405 et sqq. sont en rapport exact avec mes propres observations. En plan, la cella de la tour est inaccessible. La nef offre une petite salle en long rectangle avec centre en croix; elle fut voûtée par une croisée d'arêtes en arc ogival aigu fait par encorbellements. Un couloir sur lequel continue cette voûte amène à la salle de la tour encombrée par la ruine. En avant de la nef, un porche où s'ouvre la porte d'entrée montre deux niches profondes. Ce fut sans doute comme au W. Māhāth'āt de Lōp'buri d'étroites fenêtres autrefois, car la mince cloison qui les obstrue semble rapportée: par côté (pl. IV A) une double fissure verticale dans l'enduit montre le décollement de ce rebouchage.

A l'extérieur, l'ensemble porte sur un quadruple soubassement: ce sont d'abord deux gradins à doucines avec grande bande double ornée de fins motifs d'enduit de caractère franchement khmèr; un troisième soubassement plus petit présente deux profils à doucine et celui d'en haut est orné d'oiseaux passant qui sont de caractère plutôt t'āi quoiqu'on puisse les rattacher également aux traditions de l'art primitif khmèr. Au dessus, à l'avant-corps est une base à doucine, puis le corps orné d'une contrefrise et d'une frise à guirlandes pendantes arrêtée. Au dessus est une corniche qui soutient un petit toit en courbe ondulée et un étage dont le muret porte une seconde voûte analogue où se dessinent les côtes de fausses-tuiles courbe. L'axe des portes N. et S. n'est pas au milieu de l'avancée de la nef mais plus loin de la façade E. de la tour. La porte S. de la nef a deux corps; ils sont ornés de frises à guirlandes.

des pendantes en dents de scie très allongées. Un fronton en ogive à plusieurs lobes très accentués s'élève sur le premier corps; le tympan, s'il y en eut un, ce qui est des plus probables, a disparu avec les poutres qui le soutenaient. Un *nāga* triple sorti d'une tête de *makara* mal comprise termine le rampant maigre de cet arc gracieux. Sur le second corps de la porte s'en élève un autre dont la corniche a pour cimaise une bande de losanges curvilignes et de rosaces dans l'esprit de l'art primitif khmèr. Sur cet arrière-corps se retrouve la voûte en fausses tuiles qui vient recouper l'autre. L'arc du fronton présente un heureux motif de *garuda* debout embrassant quatre *nāga* tandis

qu'un petit Viṣṇu s'élève au dessus. De la rencontre des deux voûtes-toîts, mon ami Claeys a encore vu en 1929 un fragment S.-E. de couronnement de *pràsāt* (p. 409).

Pour la tour elle-même, le plan primitif en carré redenté à 5 arêtes à l'angle avec fausse-porte à deux corps est encore reconnaissable. Le profil de base, exécuté en enduit, est assez voisin du type khmèr classique. La fausse-porte a de beaux vantaux d'enduit sans battement; leur décor est du type à chevrons partant d'une niche ogivale et celle-ci enferme une grande figurine. Le haut de




Fig. 4

la fausse-porte nous a été heureusement conservé (pl. IV. B.) par un grand bloc tombé à terre au pied de la face S. de la tour. C'est le fronton postérieur en ogive lobée qui

s'appuie à la corniche. Je ne sais si le groupe de *nāga* voisin appartient à cet arc ou à celui qui au dessous correspondait au premier corps de la fausse-porte. Le profil de la corniche (*fg. 4*) n'est pas le profil khmèr, mais il n'en est pas très éloigné. La cimaise est ornée de losanges comme dans l'art classique du Cambodge, mais les lotus de la doucine très allongés et couchés ont un caractère spécial.

Le temple aurait été construit par le roi Paramatrailokanātha, c'est à dire, vers le milieu du XV^e siècle.

(la suite au prochaine numero)

The Megalithic Tomb of Xuan-Loc (Cochin-China)

By Dr. E. Gaspardone

The study of megaliths in French Indo-China a new branch of research. Thanks to Mlle. Colani,¹ those of Upper Laos consisting of monolithic jars and menhirs, are now well-known. Her work does not only contain a detailed description along with the circumstances of their recent exploration, but it also sums up what has been done elsewhere in the same field and the comparison with which might throw new light on the subject. However, the dolmens and like monuments are hardly mentioned in it, because it does not appear that the region investigated has hitherto revealed any of them.² We wish to indicate by an example, as *en marge* of Mlle. Colani's book, some data furnished by this kind of monuments in their relation to the general problem of megaliths in the South Sea islands and along the western coast of the Pacific

Xuân-lộc is a little railway station on the line running from Saigon to Annam, about 80 kilometers from Saigon and 50 kilometers from the frontiers of Annam, in the middle of the large forest which serves as a common boundary between this country and Cochin China. More than 8 kilometers to the south-east of the station in a plantation of hévéas worked by M. Bazé, locally known as Hàng Bông ('ranges of cotton trees'), on a gentle slope near by from the road and in red earth, blocks of stone issuing out of the earth led in April 1927 to the discovery of the megalithic tomb of which we

1 Madeleine Colani, *Mégalithes du Haut-Laos* (Hua Pan, Tran Ninh)—Publications de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient, XXV-XXVI, Paris, 1935.

2 Excepting two or three doubtful cases (*op. cit.*, I, p. 176 f.)



Pl. A. The tomb of Xuân-lộc,
View from the North-east.



Pl. B. The tomb of Xuân-lộc
View from the South-east.

are reproducing two photographs taken by us on the 14th February, 1935 (Plate IV). It contained only some earth and perhaps a few sherds of ceramic destroyed as soon as they were exhumed.

Unfortunately, the excavation was executed unrigorously by Jean Bouchot, Correspondent of the École Française d'Extrême-Orient, who drew attention to it by a communication rather confused.³ In September of the same year 1927, M. Parmentier Head of the Archaeological Survey of the École Française d'Extrême-Orient, visited the site and sent notes about it which appeared in 1929.⁴ The sketch drawn by M. Parmentier⁵ shows that the state of excavation, only a few months after the opening of the work, and after having stood the first season of rain, did not differ much from the state in which I found it in 1935. Only the circumference of it has been deformed by the sinking of the ground.

The tomb brought to light is situated at a depth of less than 3 meters oriented from east to west, with a slight deviation towards the south. It forms a *parallelopipedic* chamber composed of six blocks of granite, one block on each side. The flooring block and the upper slab are wider than the other sides and they are hollowed along their edges by a groove of 10 to 12 cms. corresponding to the thickness of the lateral blocks which are fitted into it. The thickness of these two slabs is about 20 cms., but that of the cover swells to 27 cms. about the middle. This latter on its western side projects as a *tenon*, which, according to M. Parmentier, corresponded to a projection from the eastern end, which however has now been broken. It is about 4.20 meters in length

3 J. Bouchot, *Quelques notes en marge de la découverte de Xuân-lôc*, in *Bulletin de la Société des Études Indochinoises, New Series*, t. IV., No. 2, 1929, p. 114 f. There are also five photographs of the excavation.

4 H. Parmentier, *Vestiges mégalithiques a Xuân-lôc*, in *BEFEO*, XXVIII (1928), p. 479 f.

5 *Loc. cit.*, pl. XXI, A. The design which accompanies the sketch is a hypothetical plan.

and 2.16 in the width. The supporting block is a little less wide. The lateral blocks have a height of about 1.40 meter.

Around the chamber there are lying about to-day without any order a dozen blocks partly broken, some of which were still standing as pillars in the year of excavation. J. Bouchot gave their number as twelve, but M. Parmentier as fourteen. Among them the thickest are two pieces of granite in the form of a block slightly cambered and very much elongated (7m. 50 and 7m. 20 \times 1m. 10 \times 40 and 35 cms.), extended at their upper extremity which terminates as a gorge. According to reports of J. Bouchot and M. Parmentier only these two pieces rested on stone soles of the thickness of 20 cm. and showing traces of a groove. The other blocks are of sandstone rounded or squared of the total height of 5 to 2.25 meters and their section is smaller than that of the pillars of granite (0.50 to 0.25 cms.); some of them, like the granites, end in a gorge at the top.

According to the authors quoted above all the pillars were planted in the soil at different depths. All two granites, raised on the north-south axis of the chamber, on each side of the long slabs, had their base a little above that of the chamber according to J. Bouchot, or to half the height of its lateral faces according to M. Parmentier. The sandstones had their base about 60 cms. above the base of the chamber (Bouchot) or above the covering slab (Parmentier). M. Parmentier, although he arrived three months after the excavation, gave a description of it which is much more precise than that of J. Bouchot, and he thinks that "the foot of the diverse supports went up to the periphery from the centre" and that all these pillars were arranged in three equidistant rows oriented from east to west and slightly opening at the centre occupied by the tomb; each of these rows consisted of four pillars of sandstone, the central row thrust out of the line to make room for the two granite pillars. Thus the tomb should have been inscribed within the interiors of a hexagon, according to M. Parmentier, or, of a rectangle, according to J. Bouchot.

If now from the reconstitution of the monument, we pass on to its interpretation, the divergence of opinion between our two authors becomes more serious.

J. Bouchot believed it to be an open neolithic dolmen. In order to explain the irregularities in the planting of the pillars, he was driven to the hypothesis of construction at two different periods: the blocks of sandstone would have been erected as a cromlech at a time when the tomb, engulfed in the earth, was about to be forgotten. And to explain the gorges at the top of the pillars he imagined a very ancient precursor in stone of the roofing and the palissade of wood, likewise rectangular in shape, of the modern tomb of a chief Jarai of Darlac mentioned by Henri Maître:⁶ the gorges would have carried the horizontal beams of the roof and of the palissade.

M. Parmentier has proposed, though not without reserves, a different hypothesis: the gorges carried the horizontal beams destined to sustain periodically in the air the upper slab,⁷ raised at first by its terminal projections by the means of a tree pulled at each end by a crowd of people, and "according to the charges and the requirements of stability, the several pillars would have been driven into the earth at different depths."⁸

J. Bouchot presented the monument as "the tomb of a chief"⁹ in open air. M. Parmentier imagines a tomb utilising "the properties of red earth, which, on account of its phosphorous contents, very rapidly consumes the corpses." The cell would have been "a common tomb where the corpses were volatilised,—a true ante-chamber of immortality, and the ceiling a mobile cover to permit successive burials of chiefs and warriors."¹⁰

We believe that there is no reason to retain the explanations given by J. Bouchot which are both complicated and

6 *Les jungles moi*, Paris, 1912, p. 277.

7 J. Bouchot, *op. cit.*, pp. 116-17, has noted a similar hypothesis, but only to reject it.

8 Parmentier, *op. cit.*, p. 484.

9 J. Bouchot, p. 122.

10 Parmentier, *loc. cit.*

naive: the two epochs appear to be unnecessary and the Jarai-prototype impossible. The tomb was certainly subterranean as suggested by M. Parmentier; but even the hypothesis of M. Parmentier does not seem to be justifiable to us. Not only, as the author himself admits, does it give no indication as to the rôle of a part of the pillars, but one finds it difficult also to understand the resistance of the supposed beams, or even of the pillars, simply set in earth in the manoeuvre of raising and "maintaining at a sufficient height in the air during the long ceremony,"¹¹ a mass so heavy as the covering slab. The first result of disengaging the tomb "from the protecting earth which covered it" would have been to compromise the stability of the pillars, and the repetition in these circumstances of a ceremony, which still remains purely conjectural, renders it quite improbable to us.

If it is absolutely necessary to give an immediate explanation, would it not be possible to remain content with a simpler hypothesis? The stone chamber had been constructed at the bottom of a pit and flanked by the two pillars of granite; the earth around had been opened in the shape of a funnel, and on the slope of this opening had been planted the pillars of sandstone; the gorges perhaps sustained horizontal supports, the destination of which remains uncertain. The dimensions and the disposition of the pillars,—admitting their reconstitution as given by M. Parmentier—diminishing in length, height and depth from the centre of the tomb to the periphery, produce a transversal cup contained in a lozenge of which the longer diagonal coincides with the surface line of the surrounding ground and the similarity of which is quite striking with the transversal cup of the funnel and of the tumulus of earth which had to cover the position. More simply still, one might content oneself with noting the fact that the unequal importance in the height and in the depth of planting of the pillars diminished from the tomb to its periphery.

11 Parmentier, *loc cit.*

Before we conclude any further it would be proper to ascertain what this region may still contain of vestiges of the same kind: public rumour says that there are some spots of this type still to be explored.¹² As any precise statement is faced with the danger of being falsified by future discoveries or finds, we shall only make here a few brief remarks on the questions of analogy and of age which naturally come up in the present circumstances.

Neither the absence of human remains in the chamber nor that of stones of the same nature in the country is extraordinary. The variety of the possible modes of burying, and the very large number of empty tombs discovered in all the countries round the world, render the consideration of the dissolving property of the red earth of quite secondary importance. The funeral fields of Upper Laos have yielded Mlle. Colani but a small quantity of human bones, and even these are often undecipherable;¹³ the same is the case with Perak and Sumatra.¹⁴ The jars of Assam are still poorer.¹⁵ The distance of these massive rocks¹⁶ is not an insuperable difficulty to their transport; even in France we have examples of it in the dolmens,¹⁷ and in Assam in the menhirs.¹⁸ The megaliths presuppose an organised society and a mass tech-

12 Parmentier, p. 485.

13 Colani, *Mégalithes du Haut-Laos*, I, p. 82f., II, p. 27f., particularly, pp. 31-33.

14 *Op. cit.*, II, p. 250, and the *compte-rendu* of van der Hoop, *Megalithic Remains in South Sumatra*, 1932, in *BEFEO.*, XXXII, 1932, p. 574.

15 See Mills and Hutton.

16 Those of Xuân-lộc would have been carried from the region of Phan-ri or Dalat according to the conjecture of J. Bouchot (*Bulletin de la Société des Etudes indochinoises*, New series, t. II, 2, 1927, p. 156; t. IV, 2, 1929, p. 119 and 122). But Mr. Evans also notes that the granite of the Perak tombs cannot be found in the neighbourhood. (See below).

17 For example, J. A. Brutails, *Pour comprendre les monuments de la France*, Paris, 1922, pp. 6-7.

18 P.R.T. Gurdon, *The Khasis*, London, 1907, p. 145. Cf. Colani, *op. cit.*, I, p. 127f.

nics:¹⁹ this is particularly the case in Sumatra and Cambodia. In Laos the constructors found their materials at hand.

On the other hand it is well-known that the anthropology of Indo-China is very much confused already from pre-historic times,²⁰ and that the mountain tribes designated in Annam by the generic term *Moi*, or *barbarians*, have a culture which presents such striking analogies with the culture of certain peoples of the Pacific and of India that it has been possible to propose and defend their ancient relationship.²¹

The sepulchre of *Xuân-lộc* can, therefore, be compared with the tombs of granite blocks discovered in 1895 and 1927 at Changkat Manteri and at Sungkai (also in a concession) in southern Perak.²² Unlike *Xuân-lộc* these tombs have yielded cornelian pearls, rough ceramic sherds bearing traces of a black vegetable coating, and instruments of bronze or iron comparable to those of Upper Laos;²³ whilst the glass pearls found among the articles discovered in the jars, the like of which has not been found at Changkat Manteri, and found in another district of Perak, Kuala Selinsing²⁴ and in Annam itself, at Sa-huỳnh among the coastal dunes of Quảng-ngai.²⁵ At Java, as Dr. van Stein Callenfels assures us, "the tombs of the dolmen type are not at all rare.... and embrace the period extending from the ancient neolithic to the Iron age."²⁶ Mlle. Colani, on the other hand, speaks of the "closest pos-

19 J. Déchelette, *Manuel d'archéologie préhistorique, celtique et gallo-romaine*, 1908-14, t. I, p. 388.

20 Cf., for example, E. Patte in *Bulletin du Service géologique de l'Indochine*, XIII, 5, 1925, pp. 24-25.

21 Works of W. Schmidt, J. Przyluski, P. Rivet and others.

22 J. H. N. Evans, *On Slab-built Graves in Perak and A further Slab-built Grave in Sungkai, Perak*, in *Journal of the Federated Malay States Museum*, Calcutta, Vol. XII, 5, 1928, p. 111f, and Vol. XV, 2, 1931, p. 63f.

23 Colani, *op. cit.*, II, p. 247 f.

24 J. H. N. Evans, *Excavations of Tanjong Rawa, Kuala Selinsing, Perak*, in *Journal*, *op. cit.*, Vol. XV, 3, 1932, p. 79 f; Cf. Colani, II, p. 249.

25 Colani, *loc. cit.*

26 Evans, *On Slab-built Graves in Perak*, p. 118.

sible relations inspite of differences" between the jars of Upper Laos and the ancient jars discovered in 1928 in Northern Cachar (Assam) and goes to the point of considering very probable "that the jars of Tran Ninh are derived from" the latter.²⁷

It may be pointed out, in concordance with the unique example of Xuân-lộc, that the megaliths of Perak and Sumatra exhibit a predilection for orientation from east to west,²⁸ whereas Upper Laos has not revealed any particular predilection in this respect.²⁹ On the whole, it seems that certain affinities can be noted between parts of Indo-China and parts of Malay where such comparisons have been made. It would be easy to extend these comparisons also towards India, and perhaps in the opposite direction of North-east Asia, but that at the risk of obscuring the nearer cultural relations by the affluence of more distant, and more and more uncertain relations.³⁰

This leads us to say a few words finally about the relative chronology of the tomb of Xuân-lộc. Nothing is more un-

27 J. P. Mills and J. H. Hutton, *JPASB*, New Series, Vol. XXV, 1929, p. 285 f, and Colani, II, pp. 223 and 297.

28 Evans, *Excavations*, loc. cit.; van der Hoop *apud* Colani, *BEFEO.*, p. 575.

29 Colani, II, p. 201.

30 The clearly neolithic dolmens from the south of Korea have been compared with those of Assam, and those of Northern Korea with the dolmens of India (Torii Ryûzo, *Les dolmens de la Corée*, in *Mémoires of the Research Department of the Tôkyô Bunko*, Tokyo, No. 1, 1926, p. 99). But the graves of Xuânlộc like those of Perak are much more akin to the tumuli which perhaps succeeded the dolmens in Korea and which are so numerous in the Japanese Archipelago, whereas the dolmens are almost absent (Torii, *op. cit.*, pp. 96 and 100). The stone chambers of Xuân-lộc and of Perak resemble, due allowance being made, the *vessels of stone* (*iwaifune*, *ishifune*) of certain few antique tombs of Japan (*Cf.*, S. Umehara, *Study on the Cairns on Mount Iwaseo, near Takamatsu in the province of Sanuki*, Kyoto, 1933, p. 4f of résumé in English; and the fig. IV published by S. Tauboi in *Hansei zasshi*, Vol. XII, 3, 1897, p. 11). *Cf.* the comparisons between the jars and menhirs of Laos and the jars of Japan and the circles of stones of Hokkaidô, in the work of Colani (*op. cit.*, I, p. 107f, II, p. 110 and 187f).

certain and more subject to revision than a guess of this nature. It is admitted that, in most countries the megaliths may go back from the neolithic to the Iron age, and that the different pre-historic ages do not necessarily imply any synchronism between one country and another. Mlle. Colani has suggested with certain reservations an Iron age for the menhirs and the jars of Laos and for the jars (not megalithic) of the dunes of Annam, and an epoch anterior to the introduction of Śivaite cult of the *līṅga* into eastern Indo-China.³¹ Mr. van der Hoop, in spite of his prudence, maintains a very high antiquity for the megaliths of southern Sumatra,—an antiquity older than the Indian immigration, and believes them to belong to a culture connex to that of pre-historic Tonkin and Laos.³² Finally, Mr. Heine-Geldern, basing his arguments on the very insufficient data furnished by M. Goloubew³³ in an extremely disputable paper, refers almost all the megaliths of India and South-east Asia to the Iron age.³⁴

Both Mr. Heine-Geldern and Mr. van der Hoop, after having adopted a *terminus a quo* between the second and first millenium B.C., have been nevertheless obliged to drop their *terminus ad quem* to about the beginning of the Christian era. Mr. Otley Beyer dates the first Iron age of the Philippines from 500 B.C. to 300 A.D. and the middle and the last Iron age from 500 to 1200 A.D.³⁵ And although Mlle. Colani writes that the culture of the first Iron age should correspond approximately to that of the jars of Laos,³⁶ yet she admits

31 Colani, II, p. 123, p. 205, n. 1, and 4th appendix, p. 298, Cf. p. 104f. and 120f.

32 van der Hoop *apud* Colani, II, p. 122 and *compte-rendu*, pp. 574-75.

33 Cf. my article *Fouilles d'Indochine* in *La Revue de Paris*, 1st Dec., 1936, p. 615f.

34 R. Heine-Geldern, *Vorgeschichtliche Grundlagen der Kolonial indischen Kunst*, in *Wiener Beiträge zur Kunst und Kultur-geschichte Asiens*, Bd. VIII, 1934, p. 39; Cf. Colani, II, pp. 293f and 121f.

35 H. Otley Beyer, *Types of Archæological Remains in the Philippines*, in *Præhistorica Asiae, Orientalis*, Hanoi, I, 1932, p. 133; Cf. Colani, II, p. 123.

36 Colani, II, p. 123, n. 1.

the possibility of an undeterminate but much more recent prolongation of this industry.³⁷ Mr. Evans has drawn attention to the modern megaliths found among the tribes of Assam and of Upper Burma as well as in the South Sea islands from Nias to Kei,³⁸ and he affirms that almost an identity of culture from the Iron age to the age of porcelain exists in India, Malay Peninsula, Borneo and the Philippines.³⁹ India, which is so rich in monuments of all kinds, has preserved, as might be expected, among the populations which are considered to be closely related, by their cultures, to the ancient cultures of Indo-China,—among the Munḍās and the other group—the custom of raising menhirs to the memory of the dead and of placing funeral urns under small dolmens;⁴⁰ there, too, articles of very recent type furnish the tombs which appear to be *pre-historic* only on account of the enormous lacunae in our historical information.⁴¹ Our own experience induces us to prefer in principle the lowest dates possible, and, to come back to the tomb of Xuân-lộc, it has no doubt to be placed amongst the relatively recent ones, as is suggested by its workmanship, its shaping by the stroke of metallic tools and by the remarkable conservation of its angles, and more particularly of the clamping-groove of the walls.*

37 *Ibid.*, pp. 105-7.

38 *On Slab-built Graves in Perak*.

39 Evans, *Notes on the Relationship between Philippines Iron-Age Antiquities and some from Perak*, in *Journal cit.*, Vol. XII, 7, 1929, p. 191f; Colani, II, p. 249, n. 2.

40 A. Haberlandt, in G. Buschan, *Illustrierte Völkerkunde*, II, Stuttgart, 1923, p. 478.

41 From the 13th to 17th centuries for the funeral bronzes of the south (*op. cit.*, p. 476).

* Translated from the French.

Literary and Epigraphic Notes

By

Himansu Bhushan Sarkar.

[Continued from *JGIS*, Vol. III, p. 112]

IV. The find-Spot of Ko I.

This inscription belongs to the reign of king Tulodang (919-921 A.D.) and has been incised on a set of three copper-plates. It is a matter of great regret that the exact find-spot of this record is not known. Dr. Krom¹ remarks that there are some place-names in the inscription which we find earlier in Central and then also in Eastern Java and that among the people mentioned we come across a religious functionary (*marhyang*) of Diëng and an inmate of the cloister of Siddhākārya belonging to Diëng. The reference to Diëng is not however of great importance, unless other place-names of this inscription are found in the Diëng-region. For, in the inscription of Kembang Arum,² whose find-spot is exactly known, the sixth *rāma māgaman* is "the maker of the stone for the free-hold, (named) Si Śrū, father of Bukang, hailing from Dihyang" (Pl. II, 13). He thus came to Kembang Arum in Jogjakarta from a far-off place. The reputation of Diëng in spiritual matters was such that it was found necessary on many festive occasions to invite religious people from that region. For finding out the *locale* of the inscription, it is necessary to make a detailed examination of the geographical names in this inscription and search for them in other similar records. Such examination led me to the following results. It has been found, for example, that the names of Layang, Lintakan, Kasugihan, Turumangawil, Miramirah, P.katan, Datar, Wungkuḍu, Sragan, Manggulungi, Mataram, Kaba-nyāgān, Wuga, Kahuripan, Talaga, Gilikan, Pakalangkyangan and Watuwatu are also found in other inscriptions of Java. Whenever the find-spot of these records is known, they

1 *Geschiedenis*, p. 19.

2 *OV*, 1925, Bijl. B.

refer in most cases to the region of Kedu and in several cases, where the exact find-spot is not known, they have been obtained from Jogjakarta. Thus, *OJO*, xxii, II. 14-15 (823 Śāka, Kedu), *KO*, xiv, pl. B. I. (803 Śāka, Kedu), *KO*, xv, pl. B. 9 (804 Śāka, Kedu) have all mentioned the place of Kasugihan.³ Similarly, in *OJO*, ii, v° 3 (731 Śāka, Diëng) a place is found under Pikatan, while *OJO*, vi, I. 5 (775 Śāka)⁴ presents a *raḡa* of Pikatan. A *raḡa* of Pikatan is mentioned in *OJO*, vii, I (786 Śāka) which was obtained from Kedu. The name reminds us, above all, of the *raḡa* of Pikatan who has been mentioned in the dynastic list of Matarām-kings, found in the well-known inscription from Kedu.⁵ A *pamagat* Pikatan is also found in the inscription of Kembang Arum, (pl. III, a 13,) which was discovered in Jogjakarta. In the map, the place Pikatan has been shown to the North-East of Sumbing. The place-name Kabanyāgān which occurs in the record under review is also noticed in *OJO*, vi, described above. Similarly in the inscription of Kuburan Caṇḍi, r°. 5 (753 Śāka, Kedu),⁶ we find the name of *pamget* Wuga. This Wuga, may be a place about Prāmbānān.⁷ It is perhaps more interesting to note that the place Pakalangkyangan is under Pagar wesi both in the record under notice as also in the inscription of Kembang Arum.⁸ Similarly, the place called

3 A place of this name also occurs in *OJO*, ciii, b. As several place-names in this inscription are found in the records from Kedu, there is a great possibility that *OJO*, ciii, refers to that region or its neighbourhood. Mr. Holle remarks in *VBG*, xxxix, B, p. 2, that this inscription has palaeographical affinity with *KO*, xvii, which, as Cohen Stuart has observed (*KO*, p. xii), has the same script as *KO*, I. A place of this name has also been mentioned in the copper-plate of Solo, published in *OV*, 1922, *Bijil*, L. (see r°. 2) with correction of Goris in *Ibid.*, 1928, pp. 65-66. Its find-spot has not been described.

4 In *TBG*, 47, p. 455, it has been described that the inscription was obtained from Kidu.

5 *TBG*, 76, pp. 172-215, particularly pp. 194-95, 210.

6 *Ibid.*, 70, pp. 157-170.

7 *OV*, 1928, pp. 65-66.

8 It should be remembered that though Kembang Arum has been included in the residency of Jogjakarta, it is very near the border-land of Kedu.

Wungkuḍu is under Kilipan⁹ both in this record and in the inscription of Kembang Arum (Pl. II, 3). Moreover, in the copper-plate of 828 (?) Śaka (OV., 1917), obtained from the neighbourhood of Barabudur in Kedu, we find the village of Srgan. Several inscriptions, whose find-spots are more or less unknown, mention the names of Layang,¹⁰ Lintakan,¹¹ Turumangamwil,¹² Miramirah,¹³ Datar,¹⁴ Mataram,¹⁵ Mang-

9 The name has evidently been misread by Cohen Stuart while editing KO, I. Kilipan is also known from other sources. Cf. the Amsterdam inscription of Balitung, (Inscr. I, v^o. 15) published by Dr. Van Naerssen in *Aanw. Kol. Inst.*, 1934, Bijl. I.

10 Cf. OJO, xxxvi, v^o. 12. According to the conjecture of Rouffaer in *Notulen*, 1909, p. lxxviii, it was obtained from Taji near Prāmānān. A place called Layang is also found in KO, IX, l b 4 (808 Śaka). KO, xvii of the time of Dakṣa mentions this place several times (ll. 16, 18, 25, 27). As has been mentioned before this inscription has palaeographical similarity with the record under notice.

11 Cf. OJO, viii, a. It belonged to the collection of Dieduksman at Jogaja.

12 In the copper-plate of 800 Śaka (Poerbatjaraka, *Agastya*, p. 75), we find Taru^o which is obviously Turu^o of our record. In the copper-plate of the Museum at Solo (OV, 1928, pp. 66-67), in A. II, this place has been mentioned. Its find-spot is not, however known. In OJO, xxxiii, ll. 34 (848 (?) Śaka) we have the mutilated name of a village read as Tu () mangambil. The letters left out are probably ru so that the full name would be Turu. It has been stated that the inscription is from Jedung. Dr. Stutterheim has shown however in TBG, 67, p. 174 that the selfsame record could also be engraved on bronze or copper-plates and even on paper (leuntar). Can OJO XXXIII be one of such records, originally belonging to Central Java? Because besides Tu(ru) mangambil the name of Miramirah of this inscription is also found in Central Java. The copper plate of 800 Śaka described by Poerbatjaraka in his *Agastya* is dated only 48 years prior to OJO, xxxiii and deals with institutions of Central Java. So OJO, xxxiii may also refer to Central Java.

13 As observed in the preceding note, Miramirah is mentioned in OJO, xxxiii in the important inscription of Kedu, published by Stutterheim, we also find the name of this place (TBG, 67, p. 207). A place of this name has also been mentioned in a copper-plate of the Museum at Solo, V^o. 4 (OV, 1922, Bijl. L). Its find-spot has not been mentioned. But in the light of place-names in this record it is possible to hold that the inscription is connected with Central Java.

14 A patihdatar has been mentioned in OJO ciiv a. This inscription was obtained from the Regent of Banjarnegara, res. Banjumas. As the find-spot is not known, the reference is practically valueless. A search for the geographical names in this inscription in other records of Java may however indicate its origin. Meanwhile, it may be remarked that the reference to the guru hyang of Kelasa in Pl. I b serves to show that it is possibly connected Diëng-region or Central Java.

15 This name has been mentioned in the copper-plate of the Museum at Solo (OV, 1928, pp. 66-67) pl. A. II. Along with Turumangamwil several place-names in this inscription are found in records from Central Java.

gulungi,¹⁶ Kahwripan,¹⁷ Talaga,¹⁸ Giliikan,¹⁹ Watuwatu²⁰ and Wru.²¹ There are reasons to believe that the inscriptions (or at least some of them) mentioning these place-names originally belonged to Central Java. To take one instance: the names of Lintakan, Gilikan, Turunangamwil and Kasugihan of our record occur in OGO, ciii a. Similarity of one or two names may be quite accidental, but when a series of identical geographical names are found in two records, the coincidence cannot be due to a mere accident. When we consider along with these facts the palaeographical affinity of such records the question is more or less decided.²² It is noteworthy, however, that most of the geographical names of this inscription, so far as they can be identified, occur in the border-districts of Southern Kedu and Northern Jogjakarta. It is probable therefore that the inscription originally belonged to this region.

V. *The Store of Pereng, 785 Śaka.*

There is a great divergence of opinion among scholars regarding the contents of this inscription. The difficulty has

16 Mulak is under Manggu lungi in the copper-plate described in the previous note.

17 The *desa* Kahuripan mentioned in our record and in *Jayapatra* II. (OV, 1925, pp. 59-60) is perhaps the same as Kuripan, i.e., the plain about Baratengah (inv. No. 1034). See the remarks of Dr. Goris on this name in his edition of the inscription of Kuburan Candī in *TBG*, 70, pp. 157-170.

18 It has been described as a copper-smiths' *desa* in KO, x, I a 5 (802 Śaka). The find-spot of this record is not known but from several place-names it appears to refer to the heart of Central Java.

19 This place is mentioned in OJO, cii a 5, 12 and OJO, ciii a. Both these records belonged to the collection of Dieduksman at Jogja. In the copper-plate of the Museum at Solo (OV, 1928, pp. 66-67), the place has been mentioned again.

20 In another copper-plate of the Museum at Solo (OV, 1922, Bijl. L) r^o: 3, a place of this name has been mentioned.

21 A place has been described under Wru in the copper-plate of Solo (OV, 1928, pp. 66-67).

22 Judging from this point of view, KO, xvii, copper-plates of Solo (OV, 1922, Bijl. L; OV, 1928, pp. 66-67) should provisionally be regarded as belonging to Central Java (perhaps to the region of Kedu).

mainly arisen, in my opinion, out of the mis-translation of a Sanskrit couplet in this inscription by Prof. Kern²³ and this mistake has been repeated in later publications. The couplet²⁴ in question runs thus :

“yāvat kṛhe raviśaśīnau yāvad
 dhatri²⁵ catussamudravṛtā
 yāvad daśadiśi²⁶ vāyus tāvad bhaktir
 walaing nāmnaḥ / -”²⁷ (ll. 5-6).

The last verse is translated by Kern as : “so long they honour him whose name is Walaing.” The use of genitive in *nāmnaḥ* makes me doubtful of Kern’s translation. I consider the text to run as : “..... tāvad walaing-nāmnaḥ (*janasya*) bhaktiḥ (*varddhayeta*).” Accordingly I translate the couplet quoted above as :

“As long as the Sun and the Moon endure in the sky, as long as the earth is surrounded by the four oceans,

“As long as the wind (pervades) the ten quarters, so long shall endure the devotion of him whose name is Walaing.”

This translation at once solves the outstanding problems regarding the contents of this inscription. This Walaing refers to the *raja* of Walaing (*viz.*) *Pu Kumbhayoni*. *Pu Kumbhayoni* is here the name of a person. At any rate, *Agastya-Kumbhayoni* is not intended here and this view appears reasonable from the following considerations :

(a) *Pu Kumbhayoni* is described in the inscription as the great-grandson of the king of Halu’. The same epithet cannot apply to *Agastya*.

(b) It is difficult to understand why, among all Javanese inscriptions we should find in this instance only a deity or seer as the donor of *sawah-s*. Dr. Poerbatjaraka has offered not a very happy explanation for this phenomenon.

23 VG, vi, p. 281.

24 The text may be seen in KO, xxiii or Poerbatjaraka, *Agastya*, pp. 45-51.

25 Read : dhātri.

26 ‘dici’ is a mis-print in Cohen Stuart’s edition.

27 Among other contributions to this inscription reference may be made to : Krom in BKI, 75 (1919), pp. 14-19; *Geschiedenis*, pp. 165-166.

(c) Excepting accidental similarity of names there is nothing to show that the great seer is aimed here. Prof. Krom seems to recognise the force of this point in *Geschiedenis* (p. 166).

(d) If Agastya was intended here we should have expected the usual honorific of *sang* or *sang hyang* instead of *Pu*, as they are more appropriate than *Pu*.

Dr. Bosch, while rightly criticising Poerbajarakā in *TBG.*, 67, pp. 471-72, has fallen back on his well-known theory (*TBG.*, 64, pp. 236 ff.) to explain the Agastya-problems raised by this inscription. It would have been better if the process were reversed. Meanwhile, it appears to me that his views enunciated in *TBG.*, 64, pp. 236 ff. need careful re-examination. At any rate, the stone of Pereng does not help him to establish for Java a cult closely analogous to the Devarāja-cult of Further-India. The supposed relation of the stone of Pereng to the Agastya-cult being thus extremely doubtful, the record in question does not signify the return of the royal sceptre from the hands of the Buddhist Śailendra kings to the Brāhmaṇical Hindus.

To return to *Pu* Kumbhayoni who is mentioned again in l. 17 under the name of Kalaśaja. In my opinion this Kalaśaja does not refer to Agastya and is used here simply as a synonym for Kumbhayoni. This custom was widely followed by Sanskrit authors. If Kalaśaja refers to Agastya, how can his 'sons and grandsons' (i.e., descendants,) obtain abode and life-subsistence in the god-house called Bhadrāloka (ll. 17-18)? It is true that Agastya is the traditional founder of a Brāhmaṇical dynasty in Java, but here we have to do not with a mythical personage but with a historical figure and, as such, that argument does not apply.

The next question is: who is this Walaing? In ll. 21-22, seven places have been mentioned as the *deśa* of Kumbhayoni, the sixth one being Walaing. It is obvious therefore that the epithet of Kumbhayoni, viz., *raḱe walaing* (= *raḱa* + *i* Walaing = lord of Walaing) is derived from this place-name. This *raḱe walaing* is simply mentioned as *Walaing* in l. 6, probably for the sake of metre. To mention the land-lord by

the name of his *desa* was not perhaps an unusual phenomenon in ancient Java.

Summarising the above, we may set forth our opinion regarding the contents of this inscription thus: the opening Sanskrit verses refer to a stone-*liṅga* which stood in a tent, thus being located in an unguarded place exposed to weather and all classes of people. In 785 Śaka Kumbhayoni built the god-house called Bhadrāloka (probably made of durable material), for housing the *Śiva-liṅga* (can it be a Bhadrēśvara-*liṅga*?) and made arrangements for offering *caru* to the god from the income of the donated *sawah*-field named Tamwā hurang.



Fig. 1

[To face Page 45]



Fig. 2

Five Reliefs at Poelo in Tapanoeli (Sumatra)

By Dr. F. M. Schnitger

In June, 1935, I excavated at Poelo, on the northern bank of the Panei River, Tapanoeli, a small temple dating from the 11th or 12th century. It is built on a little hill, reinforced with stones. There is no room for a circular wall; only on the north side is there a small space. The steps, therefore, are built on this side. In the north-west corner is a construction of natural stones barely more than 2.25 meters square.

The temple itself was formerly a threefold *stūpa*; in the centre stood a square tower with extensions, and on opposite sides stood two towers of similar construction. The excavation revealed more than fifteen stone umbrellas of which the largest is 1 meter in diameter. The decoration of these towers consists of strings of pearls dropping from the mouths of *Kāla* heads between which appear bells, while here and there are represented celestial beings with fly fans in their hands. The temple measures 4.03×8.78 meters and was decorated originally with eleven reliefs. Five of these I found more or less complete; of one there were only mutilated remnants of arms and legs which have no scientific value.

The natural stone reliefs pictured herewith measure $38 \times 49\frac{1}{2}$ cm. and represent a series of dancing figures—a monk with skulls as ear ornaments and a flame at the right elbow (Fig. 1), a demon with a flower in his ear (Fig. 2), a man in a dancing pose of extreme abandon (Fig. 3), an attitude found in Cambodia but never in Java, an elephant (Fig. 4) and a bull (Fig. 5). The first relief seems to indicate that the temple was founded by the *bhairawas*, who built all the large temples along the Panei. The elephant reminds one of a popular superstition in Sumatra, according to which elephants assemble in the jungle to dance in the full moon. In Tapanoeli the bull still plays an important rôle at the feasts

of the dead, while in the temple dances of Tibet a bull appears as the servant of Yama, the God of death.

Probably this Buddhist temple was the grave of some royal personage and the reliefs portray his servants or members of his family. Although Buddhistic in character they are taken from the Sivaite theology in which the world originated in a heavenly dance.

These reliefs differ considerably from those in the great temple at Bahal, which lies in the immediate vicinity. Not only are the latter much larger and constructed of brick, but they represent figures in different clothing and dance poses against an empty background. In Poelo the background is filled by conventionalized garment slips. This difference in style plainly indicates a difference in time and origin. A few very small reliefs of dancing figures, of which two hold drums in their hands, I discovered at Si Djoreng Belangah on the Baroemon. In style they are more akin to the reliefs at Bahal than to those at Poelo.

The latter reliefs are represented herewith, and I hope that the readers of this journal will succeed in indicating their Indian prototypes. If I am not mistaken these must exist somewhere in South India.¹

¹ Readers who are interested in other Hindu antiquities in Sumatra will perhaps be interested in my book "*Archæological Discoveries in Padang Lawas*" and "*Hindu Antiquities on the Batang Hari*", published in 1936 by E. J. Brill, Leiden. In the second book (p. 15) I have assigned the large temples on the Panci to the 11th and 12th centuries; the smaller ones are perhaps of a somewhat more recent date.




Fig. 3

To face, Page 451



Fig. 4



Fig. 5

MISCELLANY

Kol and Muṇḍā

A New Aspect of the Austro-Asiatic Problem.

By Dr. J. Przyluski

In scientific language, every term must be accurate and strictly definite. A badly-chosen word suggests a wrong idea; from the use of two different words for the same reality, confusion may arise; an imperfect terminology can impede and delay very much the progress of research.

The study of the un-Aryan languages of India has long been hindered by an inadequate terminology, and the pains which Prof. S. K. Chatterji has taken in order to precise the value of the terms which name them must be put to his credit. In an article published in *The Calcutta Review* Sept. 1923, p. 451 ff.), under the title *The Study of Kōl* he observes that the name Kōlla came to be given to some aboriginal tribes, probably by the middle of the first millenium after Christ. From this Middle Indo-Aryan word, the New Indo-Aryan word Kōl is derived. The word Kōlla is obscure but seems to be "an early Aryanised form of the old national name of the Kōl people of the east, which at the present day is found in the various Kōl dialects as *hōṛ*, *hōṛō*, *hō*, *ḥoro*, etc. (= "man")."¹

B. H. Hodgson first studied the Kōl languages and he thought they were allied to Dravidian. Max Müller in 1854 dissociated the Kōl languages from Dravidian and classed them as an independent group, which he named Muṇḍā.

Prof. Sten Konow writes in the Introduction to the Muṇḍā family (*Linguistic Survey of India*, Vol. IV, p. 8): "The designation of the family as the "Muṇḍā family" is

¹ About the different forms of the words signifying "man" and "woman" in the Muṇḍā languages, cf. *Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India*, Calcutta, 1929, pp. 29, 150.

thus due to Max Müller, and it has been retained in this Survey because it is that originally given by the scholar who first clearly distinguished the family from the Dravidian forms of speech, and because other names which have been proposed are objectionable for other reasons. It is not, however, a very appropriate denomination. The word Muṇḍā is used by foreigners to designate the Muṇḍās of the Ranchi district, i.e., only a section of the whole race. In Muṇḍarī it denotes the village chief and is also used as an honorific designation of landed proprietors, much in the same way as Māñjhi in Santālī. Muṇḍā therefore properly only applies to that section of the tribe who speaks the Muṇḍarī language, and its use as a common designation for the whole family is only a conventional one."

In the paper just referred to, Prof. S. K. Chatterji suggests that the term Kōl should be preferred to Muṇḍā. Kōl, says Prof. S. K. Chatterji, "is in every respect a better name than Muṇḍā: it is an accurate term, an ancient term and a term which includes the distant Kūrkūs as well....." Nevertheless, the term Muṇḍā is still used by the majority of scholars, and the use that other writers make of the name Kōl to describe the same languages is apt to create a confusion in the reader's mind.

Having in view the most recent works upon the subject, I believe that a new solution must be offered. The so-called Muṇḍā languages are very different at the present time from the languages which the ancient Kōl used to speak. The Indo-Aryan name Kōl reproduces a very ancient un-Aryan original, and Muṇḍā is a term recently attested. Therefore I suggest that the term Muṇḍā be retained to describe the Muṇḍā languages under their modern form, and that the name of Kōl languages be given to the ancient speeches which modern languages have replaced. Let us precise the reasons for this distinction.

A great number of ancient un-Aryan words, among those borrowed by the Indo-Aryan, are characterized by a system of primary prefixes such as *ka*, *ki*, *ku*, *ta*... *pa*... etc., and of secondary prefixes such as *ka*m, *ka*n, *ka*r... *ta*m, *ta*n... etc.

Ex. : *ḡadali, ḡandali, ḡambala, ḡarpāsa, ḡarpūra, tāmbūla*, etc.² By their formation, these words are plainly connected with the words of the Indo-Chinese languages which belong to the Mon-Khmèr group. The Indian tongues where they came from must, then, have belonged to the family of languages which has been called Austro-Asiatic by Father W. Schmidt. If we give the name of Kōl languages to those ancient speeches of India, we shall say that the Austro-Asiatic family includes three groups of speeches : (1) Kōl (2) Mon-Khmèr; (3) Annam.

As to the modern Muṇḍa languages, they differ widely from the Austro-Asiatic languages by their system of suffixes, by the whole of their grammar and of their vocabulary. M. G. de Hevesy, whose works have contributed so much to bring those differences to light,³ would like to separate those languages from the Mon Khmèr languages, and to connect them with the Uralian family. However, the modern Muṇḍa languages still contain many Kōl elements, and this Austro-Asiatic substratum must not be overlooked⁴ even if it is covered by important additions of Uralian, and possibly Altaïc, origin.⁵

In short, if the terminology which I suggest is adopted, we shall say that the ancient group of Kōl languages, which belonged to the Austro-Asiatic family, have been altered, subsequently to the Aryan invasion, by additions from the north. From the fusion of these elements, the modern Muṇḍa languages have resulted, which offer undeniable affinities with the Uralian languages.

2 For a list of those words, with the indication of the works which refer to them, cf. Regamey, *Bibliographie analytique des travaux relatifs aux éléments anaryens dans la civilisation et les langues de l'Inde*, BEFEO., t. 34, pp. 429-66.

3 On W. Schmidt's *Muṇḍa-Mon-Khmer comparisons*, BSOS., Vol. 6, pp. 187-200; *Finnisch-Ugrisches aus Indien*, Wien, 1932; *A small contribution to the knowledge of the Muṇḍa languages*, in *Miscellany.....R. S. Ramamurti*, pp. 30-32.

4 G. Coedès, *Review of Finnisch-Ugrisches aus Indien*, in BEFEO., 1932, pp. 580-581.

5 J. Przyluski, *Les Ugrya dans l'Inde*, RO., Vol. 11, pp. 187-192.

In Buddhist literature, the Kōliya are named often enough. According to *Mahāvastu* I, p. 353-355, the Kōliya would be the issue of a ṛṣi named Kōla and of the daughter of a Śākya chief. The name Kōla and the derived Kōliya reproduce faithfully the un-Aryan root *kōl*. The *Mahāvastu* I, 355, relates that a noble Śākya, called Subhūti, married a Kōliya woman who gave him seven daughters. I hope to be able in the near future to prove that the Śākyas were a people who came from the Upper Asian steppes. The unions between Śākya and Kōliya or other alliances of the same kind, are probably the origin of the linguistical fusions which have altered the Kōl languages and given birth to the modern Muṇḍā tongues.

NOTES

The Growth of Western Ideas about India

On the 27th March, 1937, a lecture was delivered before the Society under the above title by Dr. Hermann Goetz of the Kern Institute, Leyden. The following *résumé* is given as far as possible in the words of the lecturer.

Within a few centuries the achievements of science have brought together countries and continents hitherto almost completely separated from and unknown to each other. Thus, relations of every sort have become inevitable between them, but these relations are still disturbed by a mass of mutual misunderstanding. And as people often forget, how difficult it has been to arrive even at our present standard of knowledge, they are apt to interpret the misguided acts of the opposite party as expressions of intended neglect or disregard. I pass over a certain disregard caused by the national self-conceitedness of certain half-educated classes in every country of the West and the East, because this narrow-mindedness is directed against every neighbour—even within the same country—whose manners differ from their own customs. This is rather a problem of social psychology and has nothing to do with the relations between the East and the West. But there are other more important obstacles which have been and are still in the way of a real understanding.

Culture is ultimately a spiritual phenomenon and even the material side of civilisation is but an indirect product of it. We can export and import material goods whenever it will be profitable to trade, but cultural relations depend also on the readiness of both parties to accept and appreciate foreign conceptions and ideas. This susceptibility, however, is subject to the general

on the reconstruction of European civilisation marked by the intellectualisation of social life through a capitalistic economy and a bureaucratic state, and by that of spiritual life through humanism and the reformation of the Christian Church. We must be conscious of the bitterness of this struggle, of the devastating wars and revolutions, of the prosecutions and sufferings, of the hatred and the enthusiasm aroused by these movements, in order to understand how much they were for the moment to overshadow the interest in all those new discoveries in far-off continents. On the other hand this new self-assertion was likely to affect also the views of those who remained in contact with the East and who shaped the ideas of Europe about it. Renaissance Italy and France in the Quattrocento, over-refined and worldly, had not loitered to adopt many of the manners and customs then prevalent in Byzantium or in the Muhammedan World. But the very zeal of militant Christian propaganda which had driven the Spaniards to Granada and then to America, which had driven the Portuguese into the rear of the Muhammedan Kingdom of Morocco, and so along the African coast to India, made them the protagonists of Christian orthodoxy. And this orthodoxy prevented them from arriving at a real understanding of foreign civilisations. A scheme of the ideas then in fashion about the non-Christian world might in its main outlines have the following aspect. The centre of human culture is the Christian nations whose ways of life and thought are without any doubt the only exterior and moral standard. Then follows the Muhammedan world from Morocco to China and India,—the Moors, the Tatars and Cathy,—which through many centuries had been in commercial intercourse with Italy, Catalonia and France, which was civilised though in a less degree than the Europeans, which was not absolute heathen because it believed at least in one god, and had some vague ideas of the Christ. Outside this more or less civilized world there were the heathens uncivilised and not worth the while or

the consideration by a good Christian. These people lived on the shores of the newly discovered ocean and the difference between an Indian from Venezuela or Brazil, a Negro from the Congo or a South Indian raja or a Javanese prince did not import so much. Thus you will understand why the name Indian, first extended to the population of America because of a geographical misunderstanding, was not given up. Of course, some people on the spot had not always quite the same ideas, but they could not overcome the preponderance of ideas whose general tendency they themselves did not question.

A further stage was reached with the coming of the Netherlanders and the English, and, somewhat later, also of the French. A new order had settled and the passions of the age of political, social and religious strife were ebbing down. The interests of the new coloniers, therefore, were more commercial than religious and military. Besides the Portuguese system of tribute-levying and plundering could not be held up without the maritime monopoly of one single power, nor could it satisfy the increasing demand for colonial products. The peoples who now took the lead, were, no doubt, also by their character predestined to a suchlike policy. These other interests entailed an intensified study of the oversea countries, especially of their economic and social conditions. It brought about the financing of indigenous industries and the foundation of new ones. It brought about an intensified observation of the policy and administration of the princes with whom they had to come to some agreement. For when financing the industries on the shore, the Europeans had to leave the security of their ships and strongholds and had to mix with a population which they were not strong enough to subdue.

The result of this changed attitude was that for the first time the Europeans got a pretty just idea of what India really was. Numbers of books by travellers and other persons living in India spread detailed accounts of the character of the country and of the people, of the life and

the political events at the Mughal at the Deccani courts, of the products and the industries, and even some crude knowledge of India's intellectual culture. Some of the most important Indian languages, even Sanskrit, had already been studied by the first missionaries of the 16th century, but their learning had been overlooked in Europe. It was especially in the second half of the 17th century that Western scholars became interested in the main facts of Indian mythology and legend, that the crudest contents of the Puranas and epics were summarized, that grammatical abstracts of some of the more important Southern languages and some extracts from Indian didactic literature were published. These books were illustrated by pictures, drawn after original panoramas of Indian places by European artists and Indian miniature paintings. This growing interest was further increased by the import not only of raw products but also of works of decorative art from India. Especially fine Indian textiles found a great market and for a time aroused a sort of "Indian fashion" in Western society. And with it the collecting of Indian curios and paintings became fashionable. Indian collections and rooms were not seldom met with among Western princes, nobles, rich merchants and artists in England, Holland, France, Italy, Austria, etc. during the late 17th and the early 18th centuries. And thus the theme was taken up also by the artists of the time, such as Rebrandt, Lastman, de Gelder, Tiepolo, etc.

But this conception of India had much in common with that of our present days. It was Mughal India, seen with contemporary Western eyes. Or, to explain it somewhat more in detail, it was the India of the Mughal aristocracy mixed with similar features from Muhammedan life in Persia, Turkey and North Africa and adapted to the ideals prevalent at the courts of the European kings. The Hindus formed only the background of this scene and though their national character had become more clearly known, it was still confounded with the other non-Muhammedan civiliza-

tions of Asia, especially the Chinese and Japanese. Even in first class scientific books of the early 11th century you will find the Mughal Emperors depicted among a surrounding of Chinese temples, or a purely Indian town like Bombay or Surat crowded with Japanese Samurais. You thus see that the general conception developed during the times Portuguese supremacy, *i. e.*, the threefold conception of a Christian, a Muhammedan and a heathen world, had not yet been overcome, it had only been chiselled out more in detail, the Muhammedans were looked at with frank sympathy for their aristocratic valour and with admiration for their great rulers and conquerors, the Hindus were regarded as queer and curious, but quite respectable people no more to be classed with American Indians and niggers, but with the highly civilised nations of the Far East.

Then India was eclipsed by the interest of European scholars and connoisseurs for other parts of the globe. But it was this very neglect which prepared the European mind for a better understanding of India's cultural life. For in the same way as the discovery of enormous oceans and continents never heard of before had contributed to destroy the Mediaeval forms of life and thought, so the growing knowledge of foreign civilisations began to throw the doubt into the hearts of European thinkers about the infallibility of the Christian doctrine. When Western philosophy began to set aside revelation and let itself be guided only by logic deduction and probability, there did no more remain any reason why the institutions and ideas of other peoples should be measured with another scale. Montesquieu's "*Esprit des Lois*" is an example of this new comparative method, and his "*Lettres Persanes*" another of the criticism of European manners from the pretended point of view of another civilisation. But neither Islam nor that which in Europe then was known of Indian philosophy could appeal to the philosophical ideal of the period of Enlightenment, *viz.*, Reason. The Jesuit missionaries and later on Leibniz believed to have found such a moral philosophy based on

reason in Chinese Confucianism. At the same time the over-refined French connoisseurs were enthusiastic of the porcelain and the grotesque curios from the decaying China of the later Manchu emperors. And when the Chinoiserie fashion in art, literature and science had passed away the Western mind became interested in the primitive peoples. The reaction on the over-refinedness of the Roccoco had been Rousseau's call "Back to nature!" The discovery of the Polynesian civilisations in the Pacific Ocean by Cook, La Perouse, etc., and the better acquaintance with the Red Man because of the North American War of Independence had given a visible embodiment to the sentimental romanticism responding to this call.

At the same time, however, European became again more and more attracted by the Indian problems. Since the foreign policy of Lewis XIV had ousted the Netherlanders, Portuguese and Spaniards from the first rank of colonial competition, European politics had centred around the gigantic struggle between France and Great Britain for the hegemony of the oceans. The blending of this struggle with the civil wars following the disintegration of the Moghul Empire had divided the Indian states into a pro-French and a pro-British group, and ended in the building up of British India after the defeat of the Nawabs of Arcot, Bengal and Oudh, of the Sultan of Mysore and of the Maratha princes. Though the aristocratic civilisation of 18th and early 19th century India did not appeal to the European ideals of those days, it fascinated Western mind in another way. The new ideals of simplicity and primitivity had aroused also the sense of the great, the awful, the old. After the daintiness of the Roccoco the dangerous adventures of the European soldiers of fortune among the brutal and cruel, effeminate and extravagant princes of decaying India were to attract Western romanticism. The Nabobs and Rajas of that time impressed the popular mind of Europe so much, that their type is still alive in the popular conception of India; it may still be discovered in

many Western children's books, detective stories and cinema pictures. The other attractive side of India was her antiquity. The quest for the beginnings of civilisation was of course no new problem for Europe. But for centuries scholars had been convinced that these were to be sought in the country of the Bible, Palestine, or in one of their neighbours. In the 18th century they were first sought in China, later on, with the growing influence of free-masonry, in Egypt. The rediscovery of the monuments of Egypt's great past, therefore did contribute very much to the glamour surrounding Napoleon's expedition to the East. But at the same time other people had sought the beginnings of human civilisation in India; Voltaire had already proclaimed this thesis on the authority of the apocryphal Ezour-Veda, and the translation of the Oupnekhat and the Zend-Avesta by Anquetil Duperron and the establishment of the relation between the European languages and Sanskrit by Bopp give new force to this conception.

For two centuries Europe had been engaged in continuously increasing commercial relations with India. During this period of intensifying contact her exterior conception of India had become more and more definite and her more and more independent outlook on the history of humanity had made her eager to understand also her spiritual culture. But commercial relations were not a suitable starting-point, however, was found, when a British administration was set up in India. The administration of a foreign country necessitated the training of a staff of efficient officials as well as a closer acquaintance with the laws and customs of India. Many mistakes were made because of an insufficient knowledge of Indian life. Nevertheless we must admire the exertions made by a number of high officials like Wilkins, William Jones, Colebrooke, Tod, Wilson, Hodgson and Hastings to penetrate into the mysterious treasures of Indian learning and poetry. We need not refer to the influence of these publications on isolated prominent poets and thinkers. We know with

what enthusiasm the greatest German poet, Goethe, received the publication of the "Sakuntala" and of other Sanskrit works. We need not mention the Indian influence on so many writers, artists, and musicians in the whole of Europe during the romantic age of the early 19th century. But how did all these influence the Western conception of Indian culture? It is rather difficult to give an exact answer to this problem. In fact, it enriched Western knowledge of India, but at the same time it hopelessly disturbed European ideas about this country. Since this time you have two antagonistic outlooks on Indian civilisation; for you cannot bring together the "Black Hole" and "Sakuntala". Of course, they have as much in common as the *Bucolica* of Horace and the terrorism of the French Revolution. But Indian history was then still almost unexplored, and the few known facts were only within the reach of a few specialists. India has so long been the "country without history" even to so many European scholars, that those expressions of her culture which had become a part of European artistic and intellectual life, only with many difficulties could get any connections with historical reality. For those who knew India only from the poems, the translations of her literature, her philosophic and religious thoughts, it became more and more a fairy-country without the realities of everyday life, full of the mysteries and miracles which travellers had narrated since the times of Herodotus. When they came in contact with the real India, this was to them the pilgrimage to the holy vestiges of a by-gone Golden Age destroyed by Muhammadan fanaticism and European lack of understanding. As romantic as this conception was, it has been very important for our comprehension of Indian cultural life. For the time the stress was laid on the Hindu side of Indian civilisation and the susceptibility of the Western mind awakened to forms of thought which hitherto had seemed hopelessly strange when compared with the current ideals of Christianity. Thus the way was opened to the teachings

of Buddhism, of the Upanishads, of the Yoga, of Theosophy.

This curious situation was to a certain measure due to the special character of the relations between India and Europe. India was under a British administration, but her economic relations with the West, though in the ascendant, had not yet visibly changed. The European merchants, besides independent tea- and indigo-planters, etc., were generally concentrated in the big coastal cities and held aloof as much as possible from the people. The real contact with the upper country as well as with the educated Indian classes lay, however, with the British administrators and missionaries of whom many got a deeper interest in their Indian surrounding with which they were not only in daily contact through their administrative routine, but which was also in many cases the almost only hope for new intellectual food on their lonely outposts. Thus the connection between India and the West, though continually intensified, had become very onesided, and the disappointment became inevitable on both sides as soon as the improving possibilities of communication extended the number of visitors to India and of the Indians coming in touch with these.

This was the work of Tourism since the second half of the 19th century. No doubt, sight-seeing has been everywhere a rather disagreeable stage in the relations between two nations. For the traveller who finds all difficulties removed from his way, in most cases has not the intention to learn to understand the country he visits, but to enjoy its picturesque sides of landscape, life and art. And as he is not inclined to take the pains of an earnest study, he on the whole looks on its population as inferior only because people have other manners and customs than his own, which are unhesitatingly accepted to be the best in the world. On the other hand he cannot get a favourable impression of the foreign country because the representative classes hold aloof from this unpleasant—and often little cultivated-type of tra-

veller, and only servants, small merchants, jugglers and beggars try to make their best to squeeze shamelessly money from him. These unpleasant effects of tourism are to be found everywhere, they tend to estrange even the European nations from each other. Its contribution to international understanding is rather indirect because it smoothenes the way for the smaller but more important and influential number of those who really wish to learn and to comprehend. Tourism in India has, no doubt, on the one hand fostered the stupid disregard of coloured men of whom the tourists mostly saw the least representative types. But on the other it has more and more deepened the knowledge of the better-situated classes in the West, and thus prepared the change of mind which is obvious since the last decades of this century.

As in the 16th and 17th centuries the general superiority of the Christian religion and culture had been an undoubted fact, the supremacy of the white man and of the Western technical civilisation had been unquestioned during the 19th century. But as in that other case this somewhat massive belief had to give way to a more critical attitude of mind. At the end of the 17th century the intellectual elite of Europe had come to the conclusion that many of the rites and myths of the Christian religion were only the result of Western history, and that the essential ethics underlying them were the general possession of humanity, though in different garbs and changing intensity. At present Europe understands that the temporary control of the earth through science and colonial conquests was not the inborn right of the white peoples, but the consequence of certain moral qualities which some social groups of some Western nations had acquired. For the success of Western civilisation is the result of an organisation of thought and life which was only possible because of an extraordinarily developed sense of individual responsibility towards persons, time and facts. Now, the massive belief in the value of mechanical civilisation had received a dangerous shock by

• its unhealthy social and international consequences. Conservatives as well as socialists had brought home the conviction that science was, no doubt, a means to improve the material standard of man, but not an idol to be attained for its own sake. The disastrous results of the last war had made this fact quite obvious. And the revolutionary crises following on this war had laid open the moral bases which alone could conserve the standard of this technical civilisation, as well as the absence of these moral qualifications in considerable parts of the Western population. On the other hand the rise of Japan, the growth of young and prosperous industries and modern commercial organisations, the renaissance of a national artistic and intellectual life in most of the overseas countries opened her eyes to the fact that at least certain classes of those new countries were on the way to acquire those very character-qualities which had given Europe her international influence. The competition of American, Argentine, Indian, Japanese goods on the European markets, the numbers of modern trained men and women from other continents coming to the universities of Europe had made this fact obvious to every one. And finally the moral crisis of Western life had encouraged many people to study Eastern civilisations and to learn to understand their proper qualities. The countries which since the last war most attracted the interest of Europe are America, Russia, Japan, India and China. In the years following the war there was to be found a revival of interest in Indian culture and Indian modern developments among a good deal of the Western nations. As in all the earlier cases there is, of course, no general change of public opinion. There are people who see Western life endangered by the growth of the coloured races. There are people, specially amongst artists, who believe in the spiritual superiority of the East. But there is also an increasing mass of persons, specially among the intellectual circles, who are convinced that the future division of mankind will be not one between white and coloured races, between Western and Eastern

culture, but rather a division between the masses of those who have lost their influence by resisting an unavoidable development and those who will be able to build up a modern form of life based on the results of modern science as well as on the broader cultural outlook resulting from the mixture of the East and the West. They believe in Western culture, not as a special property of Europe, but as a general human discipline which had found its present expression in the West only because of accidental historical reasons which will be only the forerunner of similar—national—disciplines in the East as well as in other parts of the world. This has nothing to do with any special theory of public life like socialism, liberalism, capitalism and fascism, it is rather a question of a will to master the problems of present day life according to the special exigencies of every country or nation. The difficulties of these problems have increased with the growing density of the population in the whole world. The old methods of agriculture, industry, commerce, etc., have become obsolete, not because they represent the historical form of cultural life of any nation, but because they were adopted to a density of population which was only a small part of the present one. Western technical civilisation was but the first great experiment in supplying an enormously growing population with food and all the other facilities of life by an intensified production and distribution. This experiment had been a success because the special geographical position of Europe protected her from those devastating invasions of less cultivated tribes which have always hampered the progress of the flourishing Asiatic civilisations. But the essential fact of this technical civilisation is not that gigantic organisation of nature forces and human masses with which you are all acquainted. It is a moral element, the sense of responsibility: The sense of responsibility towards reality, which impelled Western scholars to control their theories by the most accurate analysis of

facts and experiments. The sense of responsibility towards time which cause the Western man to make use of every minute of his life and which alone has made possible the exact collaboration of so many people. And the sense of responsibility towards his fellow beings which guided his exertions from exploitation to constructive work. No doubt is possible that it was the Christian belief that you have to account in all eternity for the good and bad deeds of a single life, which has stimulated this moral attitude. As far as this attitude held sway over the Western mind, Western civilisation was a success; when the luxuries provided by this very civilisation diverted the Western mind from this austere philosophy, the failure was inevitable, and the instruments of fortune and happiness turned into those of disaster and death.

That the non-European countries will accept the special ideals of Western culture, is improbable and even undesirable. That they must adopt some form of life built up on a similar basis of active responsibility towards life, is unavoidable; for there is only the choice between such an intensified form of human activity or the way back to war, hunger and epidemics. Such ethics have, however, been preached by many teachers and saints among every cultured nation, and they will be the touchstone of the future of each nation when her growing population will compel her to modernise the traditional forms of life. And as the last half century has shown, India has taken this way, like many other non-European countries. The more this process is going on, the more there will be no question of any general attitude of the West in regard to India, but only the choice between the disregard of backward people against backward people of other manners and customs, or the respect and esteem of efficient people for each other.

* * * * *

During the last six or seven months the Greater India Society arranged with the kind co-operation of the National Council of Education, Bengal, a series of popular lectures on various topics of Indological interest. We give below the names of the lecturers with the titles of their lectures: Kalidas Nag (*India and Latin America*—2 lectures), Ajit K. Mukherji (*Bengal and Burma*), Batakrisna Ghosh (*Aryan Invasion of India*—2 lectures), Kunjagovinda Goswami (*Indus Civilisation*), Sarasi K. Sarswati (*Ancient Bengal*—2 lectures), Swami Sadānanda (*Journeys to Annam, Tonkin, Hong Kong and Sumatra*—3 lectures) and Suniti Kumar Chatterji (*My Journey to Burma*—2 lectures).

* * * * *

Dr. R. C. Majumdar, one of the active members of our Society has just brought out a work called *Suvarṇadvīpa*, Part I, (Pp. i-xviii+436+two maps) forming the second volume of his series bearing the title '*Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East*'. The first part deals with the political history and the system of administration in Suvarṇadvīpa (Malay Peninsula and Malay Archipelago). The second part dealing with law, society, art, religion, literature and economic conditions is expected to be out before the end of 1937. Two other volumes—Vol. III (also in two parts) dealing with Cambodia and Siam and Vol. IV (giving a comprehensive review of Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East)—will complete the series.

* * * * *

During the winter of 1935-36, Dr. H. G. Quaritch Wales on behalf of the Greater-Indian Research Committee undertook an archaeological expedition to the ancient site of Śrī Deva in Siam which was first discovered by Prince Damrong Rajanubhav. The main discoveries of this expedition consist of a plan of the city ('a main city about a mile square on the eastern side of which has been built a subsidiary city of considerably greater area'), of a nearly complete temple with a *śikhara* tower ('Temple I'), of four Indian sculptures of the type figured on the Bhūmārā temple and a Sanskrit

inscription apparently belonging to the early sixth century and written in the script of Veṅgi.

* * * * *

The Greater India Society has received and accepted the invitation to send a delegate to the Eighth International Congress of Historical Sciences to be held at Zurich in August-September 1938.

* * * * *

The Joint-Secretary of the Society, Dr. Kalidas Nag has been deputed by the Calcutta University to act for a term as a visiting professor of Fine Arts at the Honolulu University, Hawaii Islands. Dr. Nag left India to join his new appointment in January 1937.

* * * * *

The opening ceremony of the Viśva-Bhāratī Chinese Hall was celebrated at Śāntiniketan on the 14th April 1937. The Hall is the gift of a Chinese learned Society which has been formed to strengthen the bonds of cultural association between China and India. It is meant to serve as a centre of Sino-Tibetan and Buddhist study under the auspices of the Viśva-Bhāratī.

NOTICES OF BOOKS

The Story of the Stūpa: By A. H. Longhurst, Ceylon Government Press, Colombo, 1936, 54 pp.—43 plates.

The practice of burial is the most primitive mode of disposing of the dead among almost all early peoples of the world. The hole in which the body lay buried was covered with heaps of earth or in some cases enormous piles of heavy stones,—the motive underlying this act being at first to confine the ghost or corpse 'who could not easily move so large a superincumbent mass of matter'. Thus, originally, as Frazer has shown, various tribes of primitive men paid great attention to the dead, not so much from affection, as from selfish terror of the departed ones troubling their living relations. In course of time, this mode of disposal of the dead gave place among many nations to the practice of burning the bodies, of burying the ashes and burnt bones and of raising tumuli over them. Now the attitude towards the remains of the dead underwent considerable change and these burial mounds were more in the way of loving memorials to the dear departed. These funeral tumuli, again, came to play a very considerable part in the origin and development of the architectural art of various ancient nations of the world.

The earliest references in Indian literature to the manner in which the corpses were disposed of throw a flood of light on this point. In the Vedic age, when the civilisation had made marked progress in India, both burial and cremation as well as partial burial (*i.e.*, the interment of the burnt bones and ashes.) were in vogue. Verses 12 and 13 of the 18th hymn of the tenth *maṇḍala* of the *R̥gveda* offer striking evidence regarding the raising of mounds over the spots where the corpses or their burnt bones or ashes were buried: *Ucchṛṃcamānā pṛthvī*

su tiṣṭhatu sahasraṃ mita upa hi śrayaṃ tām|te grhāso
 ghrtaścato bhavaṃtu viśvāhāsmāi śaraṇāḥ saṃtvatra ||12||
 Utte stabhnāmi prthivīm tvat parīmaṃ logaṃ nidadhan
 mo ahaṃ rivaṃ etāṃ sthūṇāṃ pitaro dhārayantu te'tra
 Yamaḥ sādānā te minotu ||13||

Not only is the construction of these funeral tumuli referred to in these verses (*ucchṛṇcomānā prthvī su tiṣṭhatu* or *Utte stabhnāmi prthivīm*), but also a clear reference is to be found here to the placing of clods of earth (*loga*) and long poles (wooden ones—*sthūṇā*) over the dead (*tvat parīmaṃ logaṃ nidadhan mo ahaṃ rivaṃ* and *etāṃ sthūṇāṃ pitaro dhārayantu*). The 'house of clay' is once mentioned as the abode of the dead (*R. V., VII, 89, 1, Mo ṣu varuṇa mṛṇmayam grhaṃ rājannaham gamam*). The discovery of burnt bones and ashes as well as partially destroyed long wooden poles inserted in an erect position just in the centre of certain mounds excavated by Theodore Bloch at Lauriya led him to identify them as Vedic *Śmaśāna* mounds. What is of importance here is that in these raised tumuli as well as the wooden pillars inside, we find the prototype of the *aṇḍas* and *yaṣṭis* of the *stūpas* of the subsequent period. An elaboration in the development of these funeral structures is alluded to in the late Vedic literature (*cf.*, the evidence of the *Śatapatha* and other *Brāhmaṇas* where different types of these are mentioned—*daiva* and *āsura*).

The subsequent history of the development of the *stūpa* architecture in India as well as Indonesia has been traced in detail by Mr. A. H. Longhurst, (late Superintendent Archaeological Survey, India, and at present Archaeological Commissioner, Ceylon,) in the well-written brochure under notice—'*The Story of the Stūpa*.' He has brought together much useful information with regard to these monuments in a handy form. He has not only incorporated the observations of previous scholars like Prinsep, Cunningham, Fergusson and others in this volume, but has introduced many of his own. A very great im-

portance has been given by the author to the umbrella-motif as a symbol of religious sovereignty which topic he treats at some length in the first chapter of his book. This has certainly been done by him not without sufficient reason; for he has taken great pains to demonstrate in the three subsequent chapters entitled "The evolution of the *stūpa*," "Kerala Architecture" and "Himālayan Architecture," the indebtedness of the different types of Indian and Indonesian temple architecture not merely to the *stūpa*, but especially to the crowning finial over it *viz.*, the *Chatrāvalī* or the "tee" (a curiously anglicised form of the Burmese word *hti*). The staff which contained the successive *chatras* (1,3,7,9 or more in number) over it and which was known as *Yaṭṭhi* (*Yaṣṭi* - cf. the Sui Vihar Kharoṣṭhi inscription which records the *yaṭṭhi-pratiṭhanam* ceremony in honour of a Buddhist friar Nāgadatta by name in the 11th year of Kaniṣka) is, as we have already seen, based on the Vedic *sthūṇā* mentioned above. Again, the vivid description of the storeyed *stūpa* with a superstructure of gilt-copper discs arranged in tiers built by Kaniṣka over the relics of the Buddha as given in the Chinese records, when compared with the extant shrines of mediaeval and modern times in India proper and especially in countries outside India like Nepal, Burma, Siam, China and Japan, fully illustrates the nature of the influence which was exercised by the structural *stūpas* of the early centuries of the Christian era on these subsequent architectural specimens. It may be remarked here that this influence of the *chatrāvalī* especially on the few extant temples of the Gupta period mainly connected with the Brāhmaṇical cult is certainly not so very well-marked. The extant temples of Bhitargāon (brick,) Tigowā, Bhūmārā, and Deogarh (all the last three in stone) do not presuppose the existence of a succession of storeys over them. So, the author's general remark "that in the 5th century A.D., the temples of India were storeyed wooden buildings similar to the existing pagodas of China and Japan" requires some modification. There is no doubt

that such wooden structures were current in India of the Gupta period; for does not Fa Hian mention that in India "cars looked like pagodas"? But that there were other types built of more permanent materials existing in India at this age is clearly proved by the few extant remains mentioned above.

It will be impossible to note the various interesting points raised by the author in connection with the development of his theme in the short space at our disposal. The learned author has certainly thrown much fresh light on the whole question of the evolution of the temple architecture in India from these early funeral monuments—a theory already advocated by previous writers. Credit is certainly due to him for his elaborate treatment of this complex theme.

The photographs illustrating the various subjects in his book are well reproduced and for this credit is to be given to the Survey Department, Colombo. A short index appended to the volume would have been of use to the students.

Jitendra Nath Banerjea, M. A.

Oudheidkundige vondsten in Padang Lawas (Midden Tapanoeli). By F. M. Schnitger. Reprinted from *Elsevier's Geillustreerd Maandschrift*, XCII, No. 5.

In June and September-October, 1935, and again in April, 1936 Dr. F. M. Schnitger undertook three archaeological explorations into the interior of Tapanoeli, called Padang Lawas. The results of the first two tours along with a *résumé* of earlier researches on their subject-matter have now been published with the author's comments, a sketch-map and photographic reproductions of some architectural and sculptural remains of excellent workmanship. The report of the last tour was published by the same author in the *Deli Courant* of the 5th and 16th May, 1936.

In view of the geographical importance of Sumatra in the ancient world, the obscurity of its history in the Hindu-Javanese period and the great rôle played by the Śailendra (and) Śrīvijaya monarchs in the island, an archaeological discovery that tends to increase our knowledge of the place is bound to engage our serious attention.

The antiquities of Padang Lawas are geographically distributed over a region which is mainly washed by the upper course of the Bauman, by its branch the Panei and by some tributaries of these two rivers. Mr. Schnitger says that these antiquities principally belong to the 12th-13th centuries, although older and younger vestiges are also present. In asserting that these ruins partly originate from the great kingdom Panei "which is mentioned for the first time in the Chinese annals of the sixth century as Puni or Poli" (p. 289), Mr. S. seems to ignore the fact that the same annals locate P'o-li "in the sea, to the South-East of Canton," that its later by-form is Ma-li which is formally assured to be in the East of Ho-ling (=Kaling=the kingdom of Central Java). Thus there are strong reasons for identifying P'o-li with Bali. Similarly Puni, far from being identified with P'o-li, is now considered to lie on the west coast of Borneo.

Mr. S. remarks that the temples seen by him were sparsely ornamented and scarcely furnished with reliefs. At Sangkilon, Mr. S. made an important discovery, *viz.*, a gold-plate inscription with 8 lines of writing in the 12th century script, showing that Yamāri was worshipped there. Sangkilon was consequently the centre of a gruesome demon-cult. At Pamutung Mr. S. discovered from a temple the beautiful image of a woman which he considers to be the portrait of the royal foundress of the temple. As the image shows, she belonged to the Bhairava-sect. The greatest image of Sumatra is the portrait of king Ādityavarman, a staunch follower of the Bhairava-sect, and Mr. S. found occasion to dig out the temple of the original image at the Batang Hari. At Joreng, a *stūpa* was unearthed and, to the north of the main temple, a two-line stone-inscription contained the date 1101 Śaka. These ruins then belonged to the 12th century.

The writer also reports an encounter with a metal-loving boorish rājā, which shows the difficulties of archaeological exploration in Sumatra. In September 1935, Mr. S. found a Śaiva-altar at Bara, in the midst of the thoroughly Buddhistic Padang Lawas. Some Buddhistic remains, *stūpas* for example, were found in Tapanoeli.

Although all the images and temples cannot be properly dated, they give us a fair picture of the religious practices in vogue in those regions. If some inscription is discovered connected with these relics, they will be of immense value to the historian.

H. B. SARKAR

Hindoe-Oudheden aan de Batang Hari. By F. M. Schnitger, Leiden, 1936.

This work embodies the result of archaeological explorations carried out by the author in March 1936, at Muara Jambi. He successively describes the ruins of Astano, the Candis of Gumpung and Tinggi, then Gedong I and Gumung Perak. By Muara Jambi flows the Sungei Malayu, which recalls the famous Malayu that was identified by Rouffaer with Jambi. Dr. Schnitger favours the identification of Malayu with Muara Jambi (*ibid.*, pp. 4-6) and perhaps on sounder grounds. In the following pages (pp. 5-6), the author describes some images which are mainly Buddhistic. We are then presented with an exhausted account (illustrated with a plate) of the demon-figure that was discovered in 1906 at Padang Roco to the west of Sungei Langsat. In the following pages the author treads familiar ground, but we should note that he describes the demon-figure of Jago (p. 219) as a Bhairava-representation of King Ādityavarman. The author thinks that some of the Gaṇeśa-images of Java may refer to deceased kings who had undergone Bhairava-consecration. The work is enriched with four good plates and as many sketches. But the omission of diacritical marks is to be regretted.

H. B. SARKAR

Angkola- en Mandailing-Batakasch — Nederlandsch Woordenboek. By H. J. Eggink. *Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van kunsten en Wetenschappen*, dl. LXXII, fifth part, 1936.

Mr. Eggink was for more than thirty years a Protestant missionary in Angkola and was therefore in a good position to collect materials for an Angkola and Mandailing-Batak Dictionary. In the preparation of the present work, Mr. Eggink thankfully recognises the help he received from previous workers in a cognate field, Messrs. v.d. Tuuk. C.A., von Ophuijsen, St. Pangoerabaan and others, but he has used laudable discretion in the selection of words. The work is not comprehensive in the true sense of the term, but the publication of this book will undoubtedly facilitate our study of Angkola-Mandailing-Batak texts. It is unfortunate that in some cases the word-roots have not been made the basis for arrangement of words, with the result that the reader has to search various possible places. But in the present state of our knowledge of the languages of the Archipelago and in view of the fact that Indonesian philology has hardly emerged out of its infancy, there is room for differences of opinion regarding prefixes and primary roots, etc. : what is considered to be a prefix may somewhere form the initial letter of a root. But such cases are few in number and consequently the reader will not be frequently disturbed. Any way, we are very thankful to the author for giving us an authoritative guide in the study of Angkola-Mandailing-Batak languages.

H. B. SARKAR

Het Oudjavaansche Bhismaparwa. By J. Gonda. *Bibliotheca Javanica*, No. 7, published by the Kon. Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten and Wetenschappen, 1936.

In 1906 and 1912 Dr. Juynboll published the Old-Javanese texts of the *Ādi-* and the *Virāṭa-parva*, and these were followed by the same author's lengthy essay on the Old-Javanese *Udyoga-parva*, (published in *BKI.*, 69, pp. 219-296). Of the last books of the *Mbh.* the *Āśrama*, *Mausala* and the *Prasthānikā* were already published in 1893 in text, tran-

elation, etc., by Dr. Juynboll and it is therefore gratifying to find that Dr. Gonda supplies us with the much-needed critical edition of the Old-Javanese *Bhīṣmaparva*. It is precisely this book which contains an Old-Javanese version of the Skt. *Bhagavadgītā*, already discussed by Dr. Gonda in *TBG.*, 75, pp. 36-82.

In the construction of the text Dr. G. mainly used 6 MSS. and consulted a few others principally dating from the last century. He has also promised to offer us a very succinct comparison of the whole text with parallel-texts in Skt. As the critical edition of the Skt. text has not yet been published it can not be determined which recension the Javanese text follows. But the publication of the Javanese text will undoubtedly be of use to the future redactor of the Skt. text, because the Javanese text (containing Skt. *Śloka*s) was certainly composed towards the close of the tenth century (*Text*, p. 9) and would therefore be much earlier than many Skt. MSS. on *Bhīṣma*°. While we say that Dr. Gonda has executed his present task conscientiously well, we remain very much interested to see how he handles his promised work.

H. B. SARKAR

Oudheidkundige Vondsten in Palembang. By F. M. Schnitger, Bijl. C, with 13 plates and sketches, published by E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1936.

In pp. 1-2 of this work the author describes the ground-plan of six temples at Geding Sura in the East of Palembang. Of these the temple No. VI. yielded a Hindu image. The author next (pp. 5-6) describes some relics of Sumatran Śaivism. The following two pages are devoted to the study of different architectural styles that were current in the Hindu-Sumatran period.

H. B. SARKAR

The Early History of Ceylon. By G. C. Mendis, B.A., Ph.D. With a Foreword by Professor Wilhelm Geiger. Second edition—revised and enlarged, Y.M.C.A. Publishing House. 5, Russel Street, Calcutta. Pp. i-xvi, 1-145, 20 plates and 10 maps. Price Re. 1/12/-. 1935.

In this admirable book an attempt has been made to present the history of Ceylon from the earliest times to the end of the fifteenth century when the Portuguese, the Dutch and the British occupied different parts of Ceylon and thus indirectly brought about the modern history of that island. In the foreword Professor Wilhelm Geiger briefly discusses the authenticity of the sources of the early history of Ceylon. The book contains five chapters, *viz.*, I. The early settlers and the introduction of Buddhism, II. The ancient period, III. The early mediaeval period, IV. The Polonnaruwa period and V. The decline of the Sinhalese kingdom. In the first chapter the author describes the physical features of Ceylon and the influence which they have exercised on the current of Ceylonese history. This is followed by an account of the Vāddas (the earliest settlers of Ceylon) of the Aryan and Dravidian intrusion into Ceylon, of the rise of Buddhism in India, of the advent of Buddhism into Ceylon and its influence. In the second chapter, which deals with the ancient period; (c. 247 B.C. 362 A.D.), the author rightly points out that the political history of Ceylon really begins with the reign of Devānampiya Tissa (c. 247-207 B.C.), the contemporary of Aśoka. Here the author deals not only with the political history of the period but also with its administrative, economical, religious, literary and artistic conditions. In the third chapter the author traces the political history from the reign of Kit Siri Mevan (Kīrti Śrī Meghavarṇa) who ascended the throne in A.D. 362 and who was a contemporary of the great Indian ruler Samudragupta till the Colian conquest of Ceylon in 1017 A.D. in the reign of Mihindu V. The author further traces the administrative, and other conditions of the period. In the fourth chapter is traced the political history of Ceylon from the Colian conquest in 1017 A.D. to the end of the reign of Māgha of Kalinga in 1235 A.D. Besides the political history an account of the administrative, and other activities has also been given. In the fifth chapter the author deals with the political history of Ceylon from the reign of Vijayabāhu III (1232-1236 A.D.) to that of Parākrama-

bāhu VIII (1418-1518 A.D.) in whose reign the Portuguese arrived in Ceylon. Besides the political history an account of the religious, literary and artistic activities has also been given.

While this book presents a brief account of the early history of Ceylon, it serves as an excellent introduction to the subject. There are some sections in this work which deserve to be presented in an enlarged form. Firstly, the author has inserted a plate facing p. 16 showing the development of the must be some stages in the development of the Sinhalese script between the sections IV and V otherwise it cannot be explained how the script of the section V is evolved out of the script of the section IV. Further the vowels, consonants, medial vowels, conjunct consonants should have been systematically and chronologically classified in order to show the development of the Sinhalese script in the true perspective. Secondly, it has been a common belief that only Buddhism had penetrated into Ceylon. The author has done excellent service by shattering this idea and by proving that not only Buddhism but also Hinduism penetrated into Ceylon in ancient times. Regarding the cause of the spread of Sanskrit in Ceylon the author rightly observes (*Ibid.* pp. 60-61): "One of the chief results of the spread of Mahāyāna Buddhism was the impetus it gave to the study of Sanskrit, in which language its scriptures were written....The spread of Sanskrit in Ceylon at this time was due to another cause. Hinduism, a developed form of Brahmanism that existed before the rise of Buddhism, began to influence Ceylon at this time as a result of its revival in India under the Gupta kings; and the worship of Hindu gods and the practice of Hindu rites were adopted by many people. The image of the Hindu god Viṣṇu, which is now at the Mahādevāle in Kandy, is said to have been brought to Dondra in A.D. 790. For the worship of Śiva, temples were set up even earlier at Mantai and Trincomalie, probably by Tamil settlers." The author gives further references to Hinduism in Ceylon on pp. 89, 108. It would be well if the author were to write a monograph on this subject at some future time.

But there are some statements in this book, which appear to be open to criticism.

P. 16 :—"The Brāhmī script is the parent of all modern Indian alphabets, including Tamil. It is similar to the type of Phoenician writing of the ninth century B.C. found carved on a stone in Palestine. The Sinhalese alphabet, therefore, like all modern European alphabets, has to be traced ultimately to a Semitic origin or to some other script from which Semitic writing was also derived. Further evidence of this connection is to be seen in some of the earliest Sinhalese inscriptions which are written like Arabic from right to left." It should be pointed out here that the theory of the Semitic origin of the Brāhmī script has been greatly undermined by the discovery of the inscribed seals of the Indus Valley age. It is true that the Indus Valley script has not yet been deciphered, still when the extreme antiquity of the Indus Valley script is admitted by all scholars, the problem of the origin of the Brāhmī script must remain unsolved. Further the writing from right to left in some Sinhalese inscriptions might be due to some cause other than that indicated by the author because we have a similar example of the writing from right to left on an Eran coin in the inscription *dhama-pālasa* in the Brāhmī script of the 4th century B.C. (Bühler—*Indische Palaeographie*, p. 32). P. 94 :—"In the Jetavanārāma Vihāra in Poḷonnaruva there are several fresco paintings, some of which depict certain birth-stories of the Buddha, such as the Sasajāataka." The author has not given any evidence to show that these are fresco paintings and unless this fact is proved, the term 'fresco' should not be used. (Regarding this point see the present reviewer's view in *Indian Culture*, Vol. II, p. 825, Vol. III, pp. 397, 550). In spite of these defects, which are not of a major character this book, as has been indicated throughout, is an excellent introduction to the subject concerned and we heartily commenced it to the reading public.

BOOKS RECEIVED

The Greater India Society acknowledges with thanks the receipt of the following books, periodicals, reports, pamphlets etc., during the last six months:—

Periodicals

Adyar Library Bulletin (Brahma-Vidyā), Vol. I, Part I, Madras 1937.

Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Vol. XVII, No. IV, Poona 1936.

Annual Report of the Varendra Research Society (1935-36), Rajshahi 1937.

Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië, deel. 94, derde afl., 's-Gravenhage 1936.

Buddha-Prabhā, Vol. IV, No. 1, Bombay 1937.

Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient, t. XXXV, Fasc. 2 Hanoi 1936.

Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, Vol. VIII, Pt. 1; 2 and 3; and 4, London 1936-37.

Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. XII, No. 3, Calcutta 1936.

Journal of the Annamalai University, Vol. VI, Nos. 1 and 2, Annamalanagar 1937.

Journal of Indian History, Vol. XV, Pt. 2, Madras 1936.

Karnāṭaka Historical Review, Vol. III, Nos. 1 and 2, Dharwar 1936.

Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, Jaarboek, III, Batavia 1936.

Mīmāṃsā-Prakāśa, Vol. I, No. 4; 5, Poona 1937.

Ostastatische Zeitschrift, 22 Jahrg., 3/4 heft. Berlin 1936.

Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society, Vol. XXVII, *Tropisch Nederland*, 9 Jaarg., No. 22, Amsterdam 1937.

Books Articles etc.

- BUTLER, NICHOLAS MURRAY, *Annual Report (1936) of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, New York 1937.
- CARPANI, E.G., *La Māṇḍūkya-Upaniṣad*, Bologna 1936.
La Vājasaneyī-Saṃhitā, Bologna 1936
Nirvāṇa, Bologna 1936.
Quattro Note sul Krishnaismo, Bologna 1936.
- COOMARASWAMY, A.K., *A Note on the Aśvamedha*, Prague 1936.
- EGGINK, H.G., *Angkola- en Mandailing- Batakasch- Nederlandsch Woordenboek* Bandoeng 1936.
- Family of Nations* (Armistice Day addresses arranged by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace), New York 1936.
- GONDA, J., *Het Oudjavaansche Bhīṣmaparwa*, Bandoeng 1936.
- KOPPERS, WILHELM, *Die Indo-Germanen- und Germanenfrage*, Salzburg-Leipzig 1937.
- OBERMILLER, E., *Prajñā-Pāramitā-Guṇa-Saṃcaya-Gāthā*, (Sanskrit and Tibetan text)—Bibliotheca Buldhica XXIX, Leningrad 1937.
- SADANANDA, RAMANA DASA, *Bhagavan Śrī Ramana*, Madras 1936.
- SCHNITGER, F.M., *Hindoe-Oudheden aan Batang Hari*; Bijl. A. Leiden 1936.
Ouahiedkundige Vondsten in Padang Lawas, Leiden 1936.
Oudhiedkundige Vondsten in Patembang, Leiden 1936.
- SHARPE, ELIZABETH, *Secrets of the Kaula Circle*, London 1936.
- STCHERBATSKY, Th., *Madhyānta-Vibhaṅga of Bodhisattva Maitreya* (Eng. Trans.), Leningrad 1936.
- WALES, H.G. QUARITCH, *Exploration of Śrī Deva*, London 1937.

THE JOURNAL

OF THE

GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

No. 2

Vol. IV

July, 1937

EDITED BY

U. N. GHOSHAL

Articles:

	PAGE
Contributions from the <i>Mahāvamsa</i> to our knowledge of the mediæval culture of Ceylon (Wilhelm Geiger) ...	79
L'art pseudo-khmèr au Siam et le <i>Prang</i> (II) (Henri Parmentier) ...	97
A new inscription from Fu-nan (George Coedès) ...	117
Three Indo-Javanese Gaigā Images (F. M. Schnitger) ...	122
Two Bodhisattva Images from Ceylon and Śrīvijaya (D. P. Ghosh) ...	125

Comment and Criticism:—

<i>Siddhayātrā</i> (K. A. Nilakanta Sastri) ...	128
On the Identification of a few Indonesian Sculptures (J. N. Banerjea) ...	137

Miscellany:

Hindus in Afghanistan, Persia and Russia in 1783 (D. B. Diskalkar) ...	148
--	-----

Notices of Books:

G. DUMEZIL, <i>Flamen-Brahman</i> (BATAKRISHNA GHOSH); S. PARANAVITANA, <i>Excavations in the Citadel of Anurādhapura</i> (S. K. SARASWATI); J. TIDEMAN, <i>Hindoe-Invloed in Noordelyk Batakland</i> (NIHAR RANJAN RAY); W. F. STUTTERHEIM, <i>Oudheidkundig Verslag 1936</i> (NIHAR RANJAN RAY); V. GOLOUBEV, <i>L'archéologie du Tonkin et les Fouilles de Đông-Sơn</i> (U. N. G.). ...	153
--	-----

(8 plates and 2 figures)

Published by—

THE GREATER INDIA SOCIETY, CALCUTTA

Agents outside India—

Messrs. LUZAC & CO., 46, Great Russell Street, London W. C. 1.

Annual subscription—Rs. 4/8 or 8s. 6d., including postage

GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

AIMS AND OBJECTS

1. To organize the study of Indian culture in Greater India [i.e. Serindia, India Minor, Indo-China and Insulindia], as well as in China, Korea, Japan and other countries of Asia.
2. To arrange for the publication of the results of researches into the history of India's spiritual and cultural relations with the outside world.
3. To create an interest in the history of Greater India and connected problems among the students in the schools, colleges and Universities of India by instituting a systematic study of those subjects and to take proper steps to stimulate the same.
4. To popularise the knowledge of Greater India by organising mass meetings, lantern lectures, exhibitions and conferences.

MEMBERSHIP RULES

The annual subscription payable by the members is Rs. 12/- only. Members are entitled to receive the publications of the Society at concession rates and copies of the *Journal* of the Society free of cost.

For rates of advertisements etc.

Apply to the Manager,

GREATER INDIA SOCIETY,

21, Badurbagan Row,

P. O. Amherst Street, Calcutta.

GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

PURODHA

Dr. Rabindranath Tagore.

PATRONS

Maharaja of Pithapuram, Sir J. C. Bose, Sir B. L. Mitter, etc.

MANAGING COMMITTEE FOR 1937-8

President—Sir P. C. Ray, Kt.

Hony. Secretary—Dr. U. N. Ghoshal, Ph.D.

Hony. Joint-Secretary—Dr Kalidas Nag, D.Litt (Paris).

Hony. Assistant Secretary—Sarasi Kumar Saraswati, Esq., M.A.

Other members of the Committee—Prof. Suniti Kumar Chatterji, D.Litt. (Lond.); Dr. Prabodh Chandra Bagchi, D.Litt. (Paris); Dr. Nalinaksha Dutt, D.Litt (Lond.); O. C. Gangoly, Esq.; Dr. Narendra Nath Law, Ph.D.; Nani Gopal Majumdar, Esq., M.A.; Prof. Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya; Satyasundar Deb, Esq.

Journal Sub-Committee for 1937-38—Drs. U. N. Ghoshal, Kalidas Nag, Narendra Nath Law, Nalinaksha Dutt, Prabodh Chandra Bagchi and Suniti Kumar Chatterji.

THE JOURNAL OF THE GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

VOL. IV

JULY, 1937

No. 2

Contributions from the Mahavamsa to our knowledge of the Mediaeval Culture of Ceylon

By Dr. Wilhelm Geiger.

(Continued from JGIS., Vol. III, No. 2)

III

I. THE KING AND THE ROYAL COURT.

4. *The funeral of a deceased King*

31. The corpses of deceased kings were always disposed of by burning. Among people of the lower classes interment seems to have been the rule as still in modern times. In the Hatthavanagalla temple King Parakkamabāhu II (1236-71) erected a superb monument (*cetiya*) on the spot where the body of his royal father had been laid down on the pyre (*Mhvs.* 85.76).

The funeral ceremony was performed by the successor. When Mānābharaṇa was deceased, his two brothers performed the funeral rites for him (*kāresuṃ antimaṃ vidhiṃ*, 63.1), and the elder of them Kittisirimegha became his successor in the province of Dakkhinadesa. After Kittisirimegha's death his nephew Parakkamabāhu who lived at his

court carried out the fire-burial (*aggiḥiccaṃ*, 67.89) of his uncle in a manner worthy of himself and was from that day ruler of the province.

Even such princes as had forcibly occupied the throne used to perform the obsequies of the king, if they had caused his death. When in the year 496 A. C. Kassapa in the battle against his brother Moggallāna saw that his soldiers were yielding, he cut his own throat. Moggallāna, glad at his brother's death—because he had by his suicide spared him the necessity of meting out justice himself for Kassapa's parricide—carried out the ceremonies of burning the king's corpse in the usual manner (*kaṭvālāhaṇaḥiccaṃ*, 39.28. After that he entered the capital.

32. We see from this example that the burning of the predecessor's corpse was not only an act of piety, but also a symbolic act. The new sovereign wished to make it manifest to the people that he was the legitimate successor of the deceased king and had ascended the throne by his own right. We now understand how after Vijayabāhu's death in the year 1114 his son and heir-presumptive Vikkamabāhu, then absent from the capital and residing in Rohaṇa, regretted that he had no chance of paying his father the last honours (*antiṇa-saṅḡhāraṃ vidhātum*, 61.8). By this act he could have asserted his right of succession. He hastened to Pulatthinagara and met on the way his three cousins who wished to secure the throne to their own family. He defeated his rivals and took possession of the capital and of the royal power which he maintained up to his death.

An account contained in the chronicle 50.21 sq. is of peculiar interest. During the reign of King Sena I (831-51) a Pāṇḍu king invaded Ceylon. The Yuvarāja Mahinda was sent by Sena to drive him back, but being defeated committed suicide. The soldiers cut off his head and showed it to the Pāṇḍu King. When he saw it, he had Mahinda's corpse burnt and gave orders for observance at the pyre of all the ceremonies prescribed by the Pāṇḍus for the cremation of their kings. Evidently he wished to show

the Sihalas by his action that he was now himself the *yuvārāja* and heir-apparent of the Sinhalese kingdom.

5. Buddhism and Brahmanism at Court

33. The Sinhalese kings were all Buddhists. In modern times only Rājasiha I (1581-93) was converted to Śivaism and his conversion was followed by a severe persecution of the Buddhist priests (*Mhvs.* 93.4 sq.). Buddhism was also the prevailing religion among the people of Ceylon. Brahmanism however had by no means lost the whole of its power and influence. In the chronicle we hear much about the conflicts between the different Buddhist sects during the mediæval period, but nothing about the conflicts between Buddhism and Hinduism. Among the ruins of Polonnaruwa there are the remnants of several Hindu temples, both of Viṣṇu and Śiva.

Some of the Sinhalese kings are especially praised as supporters of the *samaṇas* (*bhikkhus*) as well as of the *brāhmaṇas*. Thus we have in the 8th century King Kassapa III (*Mhvs.* 48.23), in the 9th century Sena I (50.5) and Sena II (51.65 sq.), in the 12th century Mānābharaṇa (*dānaṃ uḷāraṃ samaṇa-brāhmaṇānaṃ padāpayi*, 62.64) and in 67.94 we hear that Parakkamabāhu when he had taken the reins of government after his uncle's death sent an abundant gift of money to the *samaṇas* and the *brāhmaṇas*. The same King, after his campaign in South India, gave orders for an alms-giving to the *brāhmaṇas* (77.105), and he is said to have seen to the restoration of *devālayas*, i.e., sanctuaries for Hindu deities as well as of Buddhist temples (79.21-22, 76-81). Parakkamabāhu II (1236-71) is said to have rebuilt the famous temple of the god Viṣṇu at Devanagara, now Dondra, in the most splendid fashion (85.85 sq.).

34. The most remarkable fact is the strict observance at court of the Brahmanical rites as they were observed by Indian kings. We know (*cf.* above 4 and 6) that the Sinhalese kings employed a distinguished *Brāhmaṇa* as their *purohita* (house-priest or domestic chaplain) and that he was the

representative of the Brahmanical caste at the coronation ceremony. This office is already mentioned in the old Mahāvamsa 10.79, 34.24. The Brāhman (*dija*, Skt. *dvija*) who was one of the four envoys sent by Devānampiyatissa to the court of King Asoka (11.20) was no doubt the house-priest. Coming to mediæval times, we are told (62.21 sq., 28-9) that the dreams seen by Virabāhu (Mānābharaṇa) and his consort were expounded by the Purohita and the soothsayers who foretold that within a short time there would take place the birth of a son bearing on him the marks of future grandeur. The soothsayers (*nemittā*) were most probably Brāhmaṇas like the Purohita. After the birth of the son the king charged them with the determination of the boy's bodily marks. After carefully observing all the marks on his hands and feet, they joyfully announced to the father that the boy would become a great monarch, though there was an unfavourable constellation for the father himself. I may here refer to the Kauṭaliya *Arthaśāstra*, 1.9, where it is expressly said that the *purohita* of an Indian king must be skilful in reading portents.

However not only the *abhiseka* but also many other Brāhmanical rites were observed by the Sinhalese kings. Virabāhu (Mānābharaṇa) is said to have performed various sacrifices which were held to be salutary by the house-priests and other Brāhmaṇas versed in the Veda (62.33). For his new-born son (Parakkamabāhu) he caused performance of the birth-rites and other ceremonies according to the rules laid down in the Veda (*vede vutta-vidhānena jātakaṃmādikaṃ vidhiṃ*, 62.45). In the Indian ritual-literature four ceremonies are enumerated, which belong to the birth-rites: *āyusya*, giving of life, *medhājānana*, giving of intelligence, *stanaḥratidhāna*, giving of the breast, and *nāmaḥaraṇa*, giving of the name (Hillebrandt, *Ritual-literatur*, p. 45).

Sirivallabha had the ceremony of the first dressing of the hair (*sikhāmaha*, 63.5) performed on his young nephew Parakkamabāhu who at that time was living with his family.

This ceremony corresponds to the *cūḍākaraṇa* rite of the *Gr̥hya-sūtras* (Hillebrandt, *l.c.*, p. 49). Later on, when the same prince was residing at Kittisirimegha's court in Dakkhiṇadesa, this King ordered his *Senāpati* to prepare for the prince the ceremony of investiture with the sacred thread (*upanayana*, 64.13), and the ceremony was carried out in the most splendid manner by Brāhmaṇas well-versed in the Veda.

We may assume that the observance by the Sinhalese rulers of Brahmanical rites was not confined to the ceremonies mentioned occasionally in the Chronicle, but extended to other rites also, perhaps to all that are prescribed in the *Gr̥hya-sūtras*. Furthermore we must point out that the compilers of the *Mahāvamsa* to whom we are indebted for the notices concerning the fact, were not Brāhmaṇas, but Buddhist priests. Those notices, therefore, clearly display the tolerant and conservative character of the Buddhism which refrains from doing away with old manners and customs in full accord with the admirable mental attitude common in such questions to the Indian people in general.

35. We will understand that the relations of the Sinhalese kings with Buddhism and Buddhist priests had a somewhat different character from those with Hinduism and the Brāhmaṇas. The latter were ceremonial and official, the former more intimate and personal. The *purohita* had to perform the sacred rites, but he was no counsellor in political or religious questions. This was often the duty of the most distinguished *bhikkhus* who co-operated with the royal dignitaries. Vijayabāhu I (12th century) granted the position of an *uparāja* after Virabāhu's death to Jayabāhu in conformity with the counsel of the *bhikkhus* (*Mhv.* 60.87). After Vijayabāhu's demise his younger sister met the ministers in order to deliberate as to how the succession to the throne could be secured to her own family. To this meeting the Buddhist priests of the district (*yatayo āyatanavāsino*, 61.1) were also invited. In a similar manner already in the 1st century B.C. after the death of Saddhātissa

the ministers with the consent of the fraternity of the *bhikkhus* consecrated Thūlathana as king (33.18). Parakkamabāhu II (1236-71) summoned the *bhikkhus* and asked them which of his sons might be worthy of the throne. The priests designated his eldest son Vijayabāhu as the most prominent of them and the king made over the burden of government into his hands (87.39 sq.). According to 76.73 sq. it was the mediation of the *bhikkhus* by which the war between Parakkamabāhu and the King of Rāmañña was brought to an end (cf. 29). The Chronicle says that the Ramanas being in despair after the victory of the Sinhalese army, sent messengers to the *bhikkhus* in Laṅkā and entreated them to appease Parakkamabāhu's anger.

It was a matter of course that the *bhikkhus* were the advisers of the king in spiritual affairs. Aggabodhi I (6th century) is said to have kept piously to the instruction of a *bhikkhu* named Dāṭhāsiva (42.22). In a very curious passage (57.38 sq.) we are informed that the sovereigns of Laṅkā in protecting the Order and the people used to act according to the advice of a *bhikkhu* who held the position of a premier counsellor (*mūlaṭṭhāna*) and whose appointment had to be confirmed by a divine oracle obtained in a night he had to spend in a small sanctuary (*devapalli*). Buddhism seems to be interwoven here with popular ideas and superstitions.

36. The connection of the royal family with the most prominent among the *bhikkhus* seems to have been intimate. The education of the princes, as we see from the manifold subjects they had to learn (cf. 11), was at least in part entrusted to *bhikkhus*, but probably also to Brāhmaṇas and laymen. The spiritual teacher of Prince Parakkamabāhu, afterwards King Parakkamabāhu II, was Saṃgharakkhita, the head of the Buddhist community in the second half of the 13th century (*Mhvs.* 81. 76-7). Nay, members of the royal family sometimes themselves entered the Order. Some instances are recorded in the oldest part of the Chronicle.

Thus Mattābhaya, the younger son of King Devānampiyatissa, and even Anulā, the consort of the sub-king Mahānāga, put on the yellow robe (17.57-8, 19.65). Kuṭakaṇṇatissa in the 1st century A.C. had been a member of the Order ere he ascended the throne, and his mother entered it, when he was king, and the son founded a nunnery to her (34.28-9, 35-6). No such event is mentioned in the mediæval era. We only hear that King Silākāla (524-37) had lived in his youth as novice in the Bodhimāṇḍa monastery in India. He belonged, however, not to the royal family, but to the Lambakaṇṇa clan (39.44-7) which was a branch of it. But we are not justified from an *argumentum ex silentio* to draw the conclusion that the custom had ceased during that period, for even at the beginning of the 17th century Senāratana, the younger brother of King Vimaladhammasuriya, is said to have been a priest (94.22), but the King made him leave the Order and placed the burden of government on him.

The *bhikkhus* were often acting as mediators when there was any conflict within the royal family. Already in ancient times we hear that Duṭṭhagāmaṇi's brother Tissa, when conquered in battle, went to Mahāgāma with the *thera* Godhagatta who succeeded in reconciling the King with his brother (24.49 sq.). The fraternal war was then brought to a close. In the 9th century, when Sena II was reigning, the sub-king Mahinda committed an offence in the women's apartment and fled to Malaya for fear of the King. But he understood how to appease his mind by prudent conduct. Accompanied by *bhikkhus* he sought out the King and was re-instated by him, no doubt through the mediation of the priests (51.8, 13-4). In a similar manner the *bhikkhus* brought about the reconciliation of King Kassapa IV (896-913) with Prince Mahinda who by his cruelty had provoked a rebellion of the people of Rohaṇa (52.9). The long and bloody contest between King Gajabāhu and his great rival Parakkamabāhu was brought to an end by the intermediary of the *bhikkhus* (70.311 sq.). Being in a desperate position

the King sent to the Community the message: 'I see for myself no protection save with the venerable brethren; let them out of pity free me from my sorrow'. The *bhikkhus* sought out Parakkamabāhu and obtained his mercy for the King.

Sometimes also conflicts arose between the royal house and *bhikkhus*, a very serious instance occurring during the reign of Udaya III (931-7). The two princes Sena and Udaya had broken the inviolability of the monasteries of a group of ascetics near Anurādhapura by killing people who had taken shelter there after committing some crime. Indignant at that deed the ascetics left their domicile and betook themselves to the province of Rohaṇa. Thereupon the troops and the people became rebellious, and the troubles came to an end only after the Princes and the King had stooped to obtain the pardon of the *bhikkhus* (53.14-27).

37. The boons granted by the kings to the Buddhist community were innumerable. In the description of the king's reign the chroniclers never omit to enumerate the meritorious deeds (*puñṇāni*) performed by the ruler for the welfare of the laity and clergy (*loka-sāsana*): the construction of tanks in order to enlarge the cultivable ground, and with regard to the Buddhist community the foundation or restoration of temples and other sacred buildings, the erection of topes and images, the offerings to sacred places, the gift to the *bhikkhus* of the four requisites (*catupaccaya*), i.e., clothing, food, beds and medicaments, the grant to a monastery of landed property and so on. Sometimes the enumeration is very dry, consisting only of names and figures. Parakkamabāhu I, for instance, is said to have built 99 topes; he also had 73 relic-shrines and 6100 decayed image-shrines restored, 476 diverse kinds of images made and 91 bodhi trees planted, etc., etc. (Mhvs. 79. 13 sq.) Viravikkama who ascended the throne in the year 1542 presented to the *bhikkhus* an offering of 2182 garments and performed meritorious works at an expense of 58700 pieces of money (92. 7-8).

We may infer from the dry form of such lists that they were taken by the chroniclers from annals which were kept in the court archives¹ and perhaps also in some monasteries, as in the *Mahāvihāra* at Anurādhapura. The annals probably contained certain important dates of the king's reign, an account of income and expenditure and similar subjects, and also a list of the king's *puññāni*. In the narration of Dutthagāmani's death this part of the annals is called *puññapotthaḥa* (32. 25). The king being in the last agonies ordered the 'Book of Meritorious deeds' to be brought before him and bade the writer read it aloud. On hearing the long list of *puññāni* performed by him during his reign the king was consoled and died in peace.

A peculiar kind of donation was an offering (of rice) equal to the weight of the king's own body (*tulābhāradāna*). Such an offering was recorded of Udaya II (51. 128), of Vijayabāhu I (60. 21), and of Parakkamabāhu I (73. 11). More symbolical is the dedication to the community or to a sanctuary of a royal attribute or even of the kingdom and the royal dignity itself. Moggallana I (496-513) presented the community with an umbrella (*chattena saṃghaṃ pūjesi* 39. 31, cf. above 23c). Aggabodhi II (601-611) dedicated the Island of Laṅkā and his own person to the relic-shrine of the Thūpārāma (42. 61). Parakkamabāhu II (13th century) offered the whole of the sixty-four royal ornaments, and even his wife and children to the Tooth Relic (82. 50; 85, 109 sq.; 86. 57). By such a symbolical dedication the kings wished to acknowledge the predominance of the church over the worldly power.

38. The Sinhalese kings not only cared for the intrinsic welfare and reputation of the *bhikkhus* but many of them were also eager for the propagation of the Buddhist faith, for the moral integrity of the Order, and for the purity of the doctrine. Moggallana II (6th century) invited preachers to recite holy texts with the commentary (*dharmabhāṣaḥ*)

¹ Cf. *Zeitschr. f. Indologie u. Iranistik* 7. 265 sq.

piṭake tiṇi vācesi saddhiṃ aṭṭhakathāya, *Mhvs.* 41. 58), and the same was done by Vijayabāhu I (60. 8). Mānābharaṇa (Vīrabāhu) is said to have the *paritta* texts recited over and over by the community (62. 31). Nay, sometimes even the kings themselves recited holy texts, as for instance, Kassapa V (52. 49), and in a similar manner Sena IV (54. 4), both of the 10th century, and again Vijayabāhu I. Sinhalese rulers also caused holy texts to be copied or fetched copies from abroad, if they were lacking in the Island; at their instance literary works were composed on religious subjects (45. 3; 54. 35; 60. 22; 81. 40 sq.; 84. 26; 90. 37; 91. 27). To king Parakkamabāhu IV (14th century) himself a work is ascribed, which has the title "Ceremonial of the Tooth Relic" (*dāṭhādhātuchāritta*) and a translation of the Jātaka tales, both in the Sinhalese language (*Sihalāya niruttiyā*, 90. 78, 83).

In order to keep the community in numerical completeness the kings often enjoined on it the performance of the ecclesiastical ceremonies of *sabbajjā* and *upasampadā*, the admission of a novice and the final ordination of priests (78. 30; 81. 50; 84. 43; 87. 72; 89. 47). Vijayabāhu I even fetched *bhikkhus*, versed in the *Tipiṭaka*, from Rāmāñña, as in Ceylon the number of priests was not sufficient to make the chapter full for those ceremonies (60. 4 sq.), and in the 13th century Parakkamabāhu II caused to be brought over to the Island many learned *bhikkhus* from Southern India, among them the Grand Thera Dhammakitti, who was living in Tambaratṭha (84. 9 sq.). The Siamese and Burmese sects in modern Ceylon were also founded, as we learn from their names, by *bhikkhus* who had come from abroad.

In Ceylon the Theravāda, the earliest and most orthodox sect of Buddhism, was prevalent. Mahayanist doctrines were introduced in the 3rd century A.C. by adherents of the Vaitulva school. Their seat was the Abhayagiri monastery north of Anurādhapura, that of Theravāda in the *Mahāvihāra* south of the city. In the 4th century king Mahāsena

took the side of the Vaitulyas and persecuted the Theravādins. But the success of the heterodox school was not of long duration. Mahāsena himself was forced to change his ecclesiastical policy, and since then the Theravāda maintained its prominent position in Ceylon up to the modern times without much interruption. However the Mahāyāna did not entirely disappear during the mediæval times². The two doctrines (*ubhayaśāsanam*, 84.10), which were made harmonious with the help of the Colā *bhikkhus* fetched to Ceylon by Parakkamabāhu II, were no doubt Theravāda and Mahāyānism.

The permanent creeping into the church of heterodox ideas is made manifest by the fact that the kings often convoked a council and caused a regulative act (*dhammakamma*) to be performed in order to purify the holy doctrine. It is remarkable that the initiative in such proceedings is generally ascribed by the chronicler to the ruling monarch. Already in the 5th century Moggallana I deserved well of the Buddhist doctrine by cleansing the community (39.57); in the 7th century the kings Moggallana III and Silāmeghavanna (44.46, 74 sq.), and later on in the 9th and 10th centuries Sena II and Kassapa V (51.64; 52.44) did the same. The church reform arranged by king Parakkamabāhu I and carried out by the Grand Thera Mahākassapa is fully described by the chronicler in two different chapters 72 and 78, and the latter account ends (78.27) with the verse :

*Evam suddhim ca sāmaggim sampādetvā 'cirena ca
mahussāhena so saṃgham Buddhakāle va vattayī.*

“While thus within a short time achieving purification and unity, he, king Parakkamabāhu, with great pains established again the community as it had been in Buddha's time.”

2 Cf. S. Paranavitana, *Mahāyānism in Ceylon*, *Ceylon Journ. of Science*, Section G, Vol. II. 35 sq.

II. THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE KINGDOM

6. *The division of the country*

39. In the earlier mediæval period up to the end of the 9th century the Sinhalese kingdom was divided into *Uttaradesa*, North Province, *Pācīna-* (or *Pubba-* or *Puratthima-*) *desa*, East Province, *Pacchimadesa*, West Province, and *Dakḥhiṇadesa*, South Province. The standpoint from which this distinction is made was no doubt Anurādhapura, the capital of the kingdom and the seat of the central government at that time. *Dakḥhiṇadesa* however did not comprise, as one might believe, the whole southern half of the island, but as Codrington³ has shown, only its south-western part. It roughly covered the area of the present West- and North-West Provinces with a portion of Sabaragamuva (*cf.* above 15). The whole South-Eastern part of Ceylon formed the separate province of Rohaṇa (*cf.* 40).

From the 10th century onwards North-Ceylon is called *Rājaratṭha*, Royal Province. The name requires a few explanatory words, for with *ratṭha* generally is meant not a province but a smaller district. We must therefore assume that the name came into use before the word *ratṭha* had got its technical meaning in Ceylon, or that it was originally used for the district of the capital with the royal residence and was afterwards extended to the king's whole dominion, North, West and East provinces, in order to distinguish it in a solemn manner from what became a domain of the heir-apparent, *i. e.* from *Dakḥhiṇadesa*. The new name of the royal dominion first occurs in *Mhvs.* 52. 4 at the time of king Kassapa IV (896 - 913) in the looser form *rājino ratṭha*; then as *Rājaratṭha* (*Mhvs.* 55. 22) in the account of king Mahinda's reign at the end of the 10th century. It

3 Regarding the topographical names which occur in this chapter I refer to H. W. Codrington, *Notes on Ceylonese Topography in the twelfth century*, *Journ. R. A. Soc., Ceylon Br.*, no. 75, 1922, p. 62 sq. and no. 78, 1925, p. 70 sq.

fell out of use after the time of Parakkāmaabāhu I who died in the year 1186. The last passage in the chronicle where *Rājarat̤ṭha* is mentioned is 79.19. With 79.86 the first and oldest continuation of the *Mahāvamsa* compiled by Dhammakitti come to its close. The older names of *Uttara-Pācīna-* and *Pacchima-* *desa* are never met with in the *Mahāvamsa* since the designation *Rājarat̤ṭha* came into use, but that of *Dak̤khiṇadesa* remains unaltered up to the end of the 12th century.

In the second continuation of the chronicle Chs. 80 to 90, 102 approximately covering the period from the year 1200 up to 1350, instead of *Rājarat̤ṭha* the name *Patit̤ṭhārat̤ṭha* is used and *Māyārat̤ṭha* for *Dak̤khiṇadesa*. The former name is a translation into Pali of Sinhalese *Pihit̤ṭiraṭa* which occurs in books and also in an inscription of the year 1200⁴. It designates the North Province as the old 'base' or 'support' (Sk. *pratiṣṭhā*) of the kingdom. *Māyārat̤ṭha* is purely Sinhalese in the first half of the compound and means District of the Mahādīpāda, i. e. of the *Yuvarāja*. In the same part of the chronicle the united kingdom is also called *Tisihala*, the tripartite Sihala. We do not know how long these three names were in use. They do not occur in the latest part of the *Mahāvamsa*.

40. The name Rohaṇa was never affected by all these fluctuations. It is the same through the whole chronicle and even in the present time *Ruhunu* is well known to the inhabitants of the province. According to tradition (*Mhv.* 22. 2) already in the third pre-Christian century king Devānampiya Tissa's younger brother Mahānāga founded a separate kingdom in Rohaṇa with Mahāgāma as his residence. Since that time Rohaṇa plays its own role in the Sinhalese history. It was, to a certain degree, always independent of the central government in Anurādhapura and Pulatthinagara, had its own rulers, generally members of the royal family, and often when the Damiḷas had taken possession of North

Ceylon, the national reaction issued from Rohaṇa. Duṭṭhagāmaṇi, the national hero of the Sinhalese people, was a scion of the Rohaṇa line. The Rohaṇa rulers were always aspiring to the royal dignity. About the middle of the 12th century Rājaraṭṭha and Pulatthinagara were in possession of the legitimate kings Vikkamabāhu II and Gajabāhu, but Dakkhiṇa-deśa and Rohaṇa were held by the three brothers Mānābharaṇa, Kittisirimegha and Sirivallabha, who were members of a younger female line. Mānābharaṇa ruled over Dakkhiṇadeśa, and the two younger brothers shared Rohaṇa between each other. The residence of Kittisirimegha was Mahānāgahula near the mouth of the Valave-Ganga, that of Sirivallabha was Uddhanadvāra. After Mānābharaṇa's death Kittisirimegha took possession of Dakkhiṇadeśa. Sirivallabha was now the ruler of the whole of Rohaṇa. Kittisirimegha was succeeded by Parakkamabāhu, the son of Mānābharaṇa, who also conquered in war the Royal Province and united it with Dakkhiṇadeśa. But his supremacy was by no means undisputed. Sirivallabha's son, the minor Mānābharaṇa, was competing with him for the royal dignity, and only after a long and bloody war with him after repeated campaigns against the Rohaṇa people Parakkamabāhu was able to join the whole kingdom under his umbrella.

Probably Rohaṇa was more cultivated in the mediæval period than it is at present; it was crossed by roads, which can partly be traced even now in the wilderness. Large districts are covered by forests where the ruins of old tanks show that in former times there were rice-fields and rural settlements.

41. The mountain district in Central Ceylon by which Dakkhiṇadeśa is bounded on the east was called Malaya. In Parakkamabāhu(I)'s time the country is described as a wilderness (*Mhvs.* 70. 3 sq.). It was difficult to penetrate owing to the inaccessibility of many of the mountains and on account of the danger from wild animals, shut off from intercourse with other men, passable only on footpaths,

offering all kinds of perils and dangerous for the deep waters with man-eating crocodiles. Therefore Malaya was often the shelter of persons who had committed a crime and who wished to escape the punishment, or, during political troubles, of those who had succumbed and were living in fear of vengeance of their victorious rivals.

It is easily intelligible that in this country the boundaries between Rājaraṭṭha, Dakkhiṇadesa and Rohaṇa were uncertain and floating. The king may have formally laid claim to the supremacy but the actual power was in the hands of local chiefs. This becomes evident from the description of Parakkamabāhu's campaigns in Dumbura and the adjoining Malaya districts E. and N. E. of the present town of Kandy. He had resolved to occupy Malaya, no doubt, in order to prevent an attack from the rear⁵ and to have a sure base for the intended attack on Rājaraṭṭha itself. So much is certain that he never considered those districts to be part of Rājaraṭṭha. When he had taken possession of them he returned to his residence and spent some time there in rest and sport. Warlike preparations were certainly not neglected during that time. But it is explicitly stated in the chronicle that only after this interval he commanded his generals to take possession of Rājaraṭṭha also (*gahetuṃ Rājaraṭṭham pi yojayi daṇḍa-nāyake*, 70. 55). The actual frontier of the royal province was further to the North between Ambavanaraṭṭha in the valley of the Ambanganga and the district of Janapada. This appears clearly from the description of Prince Parakkamabāhu's road on his visit to Pulatthinagara. It is said in the chronicle that he crossed the frontier of his uncle's province (Dakkhiṇadesa) at that place and reached the realm of King Gajabāhu (*piturañño raṭṭhasīmaṃ samullaṅghiy' upāgami Gajabāhussa rajjamaṃhi ṭhānaṃ Janapada-vhayaṃ*, 66. 110)

42. In order to make the administration possible the

5 G. C. Mendis, *Early History of Ceylon*, p. 78.

provinces were divided into districts. The word for 'district' is *raṭṭha*. The link between *raṭṭha* 'kingdom' and *raṭṭha* 'district' is the meaning 'open, rural country'. This meaning in contrast with the fortified town, is also that of Skt. *rāṣṭra* in the Kauṭīliya *Arthaśāstra*⁶; in Pali this would also be *janapada*. By a certain number of districts a larger unit was formed, called *maṇḍala* which I propose to translate by *canton*. From Mhvs. 69.15-16 we may infer that in Dakkhinadesa there were in the 12th century twelve cantons and eighty-four districts. Therefore a canton seems to have consisted of seven districts. Later on in the 13th century the kingdom seems to have been divided into eighteen *desā* or provinces:—*aṭṭharasadesa-nivāsino*. 'the inhabitants of the eighteen provinces' (86. 11).

We do not know when such an organisation was formed nor how far it was carried through in the kingdom. From the chronicle we might assume that in the twelfth century it chiefly existed in Dakkhinadesa, and it is not impossible that the administration was more developed here than in other provinces. It is a well-known fact that the heir-apparent of a kingdom is often in a kind of opposition to the reigning monarch and more accessible than he to modern ideas and methods, and Dakkhinadesa had been through centuries the domain of the Yuvarāja, and, as such, may have more progressed than Rājaratṭha and Rohaṇa. Is it, for instance, a mere coincidence that with only one or two exceptions no district of Rohaṇa is mentioned in the chronicle, though numerous topographical names occur in the description of the various campaigns in that province of Parakkamabāhu? Frequently the colourless general term *ṭhāna* 'locality' is used here in the chronicle.

The exceptions are Navayojanaratṭha (72.60) and Dvādasasahassakarattṭha (61.22). The former was situated

6 J. J. Meyer, *Das Altindische Buch vom Welt- und Staatsleben*, p. 24, n. 1.

in the extreme South-Western corner of Rohaṇa and it extended along the frontier of Dakkhiṇadesa opposite to Pañcayojanaraṭṭha which belonged to this province. Apparently Pañcayojanaraṭṭha corresponds to the modern Pasdun Korale. Dvādasasahassaka is no district at all in the technical sense of the word, but the South-West half of Rohaṇa and Kittisirimegha's share of this province when he partitioned it with his brother (*cf.* above 40). The name of Hūvaraṭṭha (60.66) is of course the same as the present Uva; it had however at that time (end of the 11th century) not such an extension, but was simply a district of Malaya, East of Adam's Peak.

Cantons (*maṇḍalāni*) mentioned in Rohaṇa are: Dighavāpi-, Guttahāla-, Mahāgāma-, Giri-, Uruvela-, and Mālavatthu-maṇḍala. The first was the country round the Mahakandiya-tank, about thirty miles South-South-West of Batticaloa, and the name of the second is preserved in the present village and district of Buttala. Mahāgāma-maṇḍala was the canton where the old capital of Rohaṇa was situated. The situation of the three last cantons cannot be fixed with topographical precision, but they belonged, no doubt, to the same part of Rohaṇa as Dighavāpi and Guttahāla.

43. Many districts (*raṭṭhāni*) of Dakkhiṇadesa are enumerated in the account of Parakkamabāhu's war with King Gajabāhu, especially those extending along the Northern and North-Eastern frontier of the province (Mhvs. 70. 53 sq.). The list may be confirmed and supplemented by other passages of the chronicle (*cf.* 69.5 sq.). All these districts, beginning on the West with Mallavālāna and Tabbāraṭṭha on the left bank of the Kalā-oya and ending on the East with Ambavanaraṭṭha, north of the present Mātale, were the base of military operations of Parakkamabāhu's generals against Gajabāhu. Is it again only a coincidence that on the opposite side in Rājaraṭṭha no 'district' is named except Janapada, and this district is called *raṭṭha* in two passages only (44.56 ; 70.95), in all

the other passages simply *ṭhāna*, or the name is quoted without any qualification?

Some districts and one canton (*Dhanumaṇḍala*, 70.17) are mentioned in *Malaya* in the description of Parakkamabāhu's campaign against this hilly country (cf. 41). It is however doubtful if *raṭṭha* and *maṇḍala* here are to be understood as words for administrative circuits or for local units governed by local chiefs who did not acknowledge the supremacy either of Rājaraṭṭha (cf. 70.7) or of Dakkhiṇadesa. In two of the names there met with, the word *vagga* (Skt. *varga*) is used approximately in the sense of *raṭṭha*, *Majjhimaṇḍala* and *Kosavagga*. The same word also occurs in a few other topographical names as *Mereliya-* and *Doṇivagga*. To the latter appears to correspond the modern *Denavaka*, the denomination of the surroundings of *Pelmadulla*, East of *Ratnapura*.

On the whole we may form the impression that it was Parakkamabāhu himself who extended or tried to extend the organisation existing in Dakkhiṇadesa over the other provinces, at least over Rājaraṭṭha, after he had obtained the royal power and dignity.

To be continued.

Neubiberg.

L'art Pseudo-Khmer Au Siam et le *Prang*

Par Dr. H. Parmentier

II

Le monument bien conserve du W. Mäháth'át de Rātburi nous ramène plus sûrement dans la famille du *prang*. L'édifice forme le centre d'un groupe de cinq *th'át* disposés en croix au milieu d'une pagode importante et son axe principal est dirigé E. 10° N.—Le plan de l'édifice principal est encore ce plan bâtard qui encadre le carré du *prang* de quatre portes dont trois sont fausses et dont la principale n'apparaît que par ses frontons au dessus d'une étroite avancée qui tient à la fois de la nef antérieure et de l'avant-corps: elle est ouverte par une porte à l'Est.

A l'extérieur, la tour est redentée à cinq arêtes par angle et ses fausses-portes sont à double plan. Le corps de l'édifice s'enferme entre deux frises considérables et sa haute corniche porte six étages à grandes antéfixes; un dernier étage conique peu clair reçoit un splendide épi dans l'esprit d'un *triçula* qui aurait 13 pointes en plusieurs étages. Les fausses-baies commencent à compter à peine et donnent plutôt l'impression de grandes antéfixes. Malgré la hauteur considérable de l'étage principal, les superstructures tiennent une place énorme et l'immense nu du corps compte à peine dans l'ensemble pour un quart.

L'édifice est relevé par un quadruple soubassement important qui est commun jusqu'au troisième gradin en partant d'en bas. Ses éléments sont formés de deux doucines opposées autour d'une large bague plate double. Le quatrième gradin est un bahut, moins haut à la nef. A la tour, il offre plinthe et cimaise ornées et la cimaise forme la plinthe de la base du corps; plinthe et cimaise du

bahut sont séparées par un rang de lotus ; la plinthe se décore de rosaces en fleurs saillantes, la cimaise de grands losanges.

Ce bahut est réduit à une doucine et une cimaise sous la nef ; les profils de celle-ci, base et doucine, diminuent d'importance, de telle sorte que la cimaise de la corniche du bas-côté fictif atteint à peine la corniche des pilastres à la porte E. presque invisible de la tour. Cette nef antérieure élève au centre un faux étage voûté ; elle n'a pas de fausses-portes et son long mur s'étend nu jusqu'au pignon qui contre l'ordinaire part dans toute la largeur au dessus de la corniche de basse-nef. Cette disposition permet de donner plus d'importance au fronton de la porte E. d'entrée et par suite à la porte elle-même. Mais aussi la corniche de ses pilastres doit être descendue pour échapper à celle de la basse-nef et le dessous du linteau se place beaucoup plus bas que ceux des fausses portes de la tour, composition légèrement boiteuse.

Les *prang* latéraux s'élèverent sur le grand soubassement et vont jusqu'au *prang* central ; leur base paraît plus petite que la sienne. Ils montrent cinq arêtes dans leurs superstructures, quatre à leur corps et le nombre de celles-ci diminue dans les soubassements en descendant pour finir par deux. La masse de la tour n'a aucune ouverture, mais le soubassement montre une fausse-porte ; sa corniche vient mourir sur le corps même du *prang* et soutient un petit étage garni d'un fronton double en triangle qui ne rime à rien. Sur la corniche de la tour s'élèvent quatre étages d'antéfixes. L'impression de *prang* t'ai que donne déjà la grande tour s'accroît dans ces édifices latéraux. Quant aux deux autres sur l'axe E.-O. ils sont d'un autre esprit et se terminent par un *stûpa* en cloche et une pointe annelée.

Avec le dernier édifice de la série nous retombons sur un monument qui est nettement d'origine khmère. Le W. Kham Pen Leng 887 de P'éc'āburi a déjà été décrit et étudié par Lajonquière et il signale la façon dont les

Siamois on⁴ fait d'un *gopura* oriental un sanctuaire supplémentaire. Le groupe présente les mêmes particularités que le W. Sâm Yôt: construction de latérite sans mortier et ornementation de caractère siamois en enduit; son histoire est vraisemblablement la même et nous n'y insisterons pas.

Avant de clore cette revue examinons ceux des monuments où la forme du *prang* s'accuse nettement et où l'on ne peut plus guère voir le souvenir de l'art khmèr que par la présence d'une série d'étages rapprochés sur un corps carré redenté accompagné de baies vraies ou fausses sur les axes.

Le *prang* qui forme le noyau du W. Măhăth'ăt de Săvănk 'ălòk est de ce genre; il est bien représenté dans l'article Claeys par les pl. LXVIII et LXIX. Il constitue le centre d'un *văt* important dont Fournereau donne le plan dans le t. II pl. XXXVII sous le nom de Vat Phra: Prang de Săngkălòk. L'édifice offre trois étages de soubassement redentés avec profils à doucine autour d'une bague à deux plans. Le corps peu important a une grande base et une faible corniche; il est accompagné sur chaque axe par une fausse-porte à deux plans avec fronton ogival lobé terminé par des *nāga*. Au dessus sont 8 étages avec grandes antéfixes d'angle; sur l'axe, le redent central surmonté d'une antéfixe creuse joue le rôle de fausse-baie. La tour s'achève par une partie ronde et lisse, réparation récente, terminée par un anneau d'où part une énorme terminaison en quadruple *triçula*, en trois étages et enfin la pointe terminale à sept bagues-parasols.

L'édifice est précédé par un avant-corps peu accusé mais qui forme encore une petite nef détachée sous le fronton de la baie de l'Est. Elle abrite un long couloir qui conduit à une cellule enfermée dans le *prang*: elle était abritée par un plafond qui a été déposé au Musée: il était taillé dans un énorme morceau de bois de rose; c'est une grande rosace à cinq zones dont les deux extérieures sont traitées en pétales de lotus mais entière-

ment découpés par des décors; la forme carrée est rattrapée par quatre motifs d'angle qui laissent une large bande creuse peinte en rouge autour de la rosace centrale. Ses écoinçons ont des motifs de rinceaux extrêmement jolis enfermant un personnage à mi-corps en prière qui sort de lotus.

Le dernier grand exemple est le *prang* du W. Māhāth'at de P'isṇulòk (Cl. pl. LXIII). Il semble bien près de donner le dernier terme de l'évolution quoiqu' il n'ait été construit qu'en 1482. Sur un terre-plein d'un mètre s'élève un petit soubassement redenté, puis un soubassement à corniche, enfin trois soubassements moulurés qui vont en se réduisant; le tout forme un ensemble d'une grande hauteur. Alors s'élève le corps même du *prang* à cinq redents par angle et fausses-portes en saillie à deux plans soutenant ensemble trois frontons ogivaux. Au dessus un petit étage à multiples redents s'orne de *garuḍa* presque entièrement détachés du fond. On voit ensuite quatre étages à 7 redents par angle, garnis de grandes antéfixes d'angle simples entourant chaque fois une antéfixe de face ornée d'une figure; elle compte pour la fausse-baie. Deux autres étages d'antéfixes se retournent en arrière pour donner la courbure et celles d'axe ne présentent plus de sculpture. Au dessus est un petit plateau rond d'où part un *triṇṇala* quadruple à 7 branches. Sur la face E., l'avant-corps s'est réduit et c'est à peine si la porte orientale est plus saillante que les trois fausses-portes. Un escalier garni de rampants en *nāga* précédés de *deva* en prière et de lions conduit à la porte centrale de l'Est qui donne accès à une petite salle antérieure. Les parois du corps du *prang* entre frise et contrefrise ont un fruit marqué. Cette partie est faible comme hauteur pour l'ensemble et n'en compte guère que le septième. Comme le remarque très justement Claeys, p. 404 "la proportion générale de l'ensemble a évolué et s'est en quelque sorte abâtardie. Au lieu de s'affiner en ogive le profil de la tour monte

verticalement au long de quatre étages, puis s'amincit brusquement et angulairement vers le sommet. Cela donne à ce vaste dôme fait de petits éléments un aspect lourd et disggacieux d'où toute dominante est exclue."

Plus étirés encore en longueur les deux modèles, sans doute un peu artificiels, du W. P'ṛă Th'ăt de P'ṛc'ăburi donnés dans la pl. Cl. XLVI ne font qu'accen-tuer les caractères de cette évolution. On en verra le terminus follement aminci et malgré la surcharge de décors devenu d'une sécheresse désespérante dans le grand *prang* du W. Cen à Bangkok (pl. III B).

Résumons et déblayons cette série. Le charmant édifice du W. Suon Dok ne me paraît pas à retenir ici; il viendra mieux se placer dans une autre section que nous consacrerons au rappel des éléments indiens plutôt que spécialement khmèrs; on sentira alors pourquoi; d'ailleurs sa date tardive en face de son caractère antique empêchent d'y voir un échelon et surtout le départ de l'évolution.

Peuvent être considérés comme des monuments réellement khmèrs caractérisés par leur construction différente de celle du Siam mais plus ou moins modifiés par l'appli-cation d'enduits locaux les 7 monuments suivants: le W. Sa'n P'ṛă Sùà Mùong, le W. P'ṛă P'ai Luo'ng de Sukhót'ăi, le W. Săn P'ṛă Kan, le W. Nak'on Kōsá, le W. Deva Sathan Prang et le W. Prang Sám Yôt de Lōp'buri, le W. Kham Pan Leng de P'ṛc'ăburi.

Nous classerons comme pseudo-khmèrs les 10 autres: le W. Sisăvái de Sūkhót'ăi, le W. Măhăth'ăt, le Raj Bunah et le W. P'utth'aisăvăn d'Āyuthia, le W. Măhăth'ăt de Lōp'đuri, Cuḷamăṇi de P'iṣṇulđk, les W. Măhăth'ăt de Rătburī, de Săvănk'ălok et de P'iṣṇulđk, le W. P'ṛă Th'ăt de P'ṛc'ăburi.

Nous ne nous attarderons pas aux 7 premiers. Les formes de leurs masses ne sont pas assez caractéristiques—réduits à l'épannelage, les monuments khmèrs se ressemblent fort—pour qu'on puisse les dater avec

précision, faute d'éléments sûrs de discrimination. Tout ce qu'on peut dire de la plupart et c'est le cas en particulier pour le W. P'ra P'ai Luóng, c'est qu'ils paraissent plutôt antérieurs aux derniers règnes constructeurs du Cambodge; ils sembleraient ainsi plutôt des bâtiments élevés dans les premiers temps de la domination khmère. Seuls Prang Sâm Yôt et peut-être Kham Pen Leng pourraient être des derniers et compter comme de la fin du XII^e ou du XIII^e siècle.

La question est autrement délicate et plus intéressante pour les dix autres. Qu'on les compare aux monuments du XI^e s., date la plus haute jusqu'où on puisse les faire remonter ou à ceux du XII^e s. et du début du XIII^e, dernière époque où l'art khmèr a largement construit en matériaux robustes, le rapprochement des formes est difficile et l'on ne trouve qu'une ressemblance réelle mais vague. Pour la dernière période où la comparaison est plus aisée et qu'une bonne part des dates ou des traditions réclame, la ressemblance s'efface encore plus et ce n'est pas seulement la version spéciale de l'enduit qui les différencie. En plus de l'ornementation, les temples de cette période au Cambodge se caractérisent par quelques dispositions particulières: enceintes de galeries, composition de salles ou de vestibules à trois nefs, le plus souvent fausses, triomphe de la sculpture qui devient partie constructive de l'architecture, usage courant et économique de la fausse-fenêtre. D'autre part le Cambodge paraît avoir abandonné complètement à cette époque l'usage de la brique: son emploi en maçonnerie semble avoir fleuri surtout aux temps où le Khmèr n'était pas encore maître de l'utilisation du grès et on la voit alors longtemps régner dans les plus grands temples, accompagnée de l'enduit; le Khmèr a peu taillé directement la brique comme le faisait couramment le Cam et s'il n'y emploie l'enduit, il interpose des blocs de pierre là où il veut exécuter son fin décor. Quand le grès commence à former la masse des plus grands monuments, la brique n'est plus

que d'une utilité partielle; deux rôles lui sont attribués : dans le grand temple elle garantit par son monolithisme artificiel¹ l'équilibre des voûtes qu'on redoute encore de construire en pierres encorbellées;—elle fournit la matière des sanctuaires provinciaux, surtout quand ils sont de petite taille. A l'heure du triomphe de la pierre, dans la seconde moitié du XII^e et au XIII^e siècles, la brique disparaît même dans les deux cas : la voûte est réalisée en grès et a généralement tenu quand la végétation ne l'a pas attaquée; d'autre part je ne connais pas un seul sanctuaire isolé dans la campagne de tout le Cambodge qui offre les décors et les modes caractéristiques de l'art du Bâyon. L'enduit, de même, a cessé d'être utilisé au Cambodge dès la fin du X^e siècle.

Les édifices qui nous intriguent n'ont aucun des éléments spéciaux que nous venons de signaler et la brique, d'ailleurs liée par le mortier apparent y est d'un usage courant. Chose curieuse même elle réagit sur l'emploi de la latérite, comme si la seconde était venue à l'occasion se substituer à la première. Tandis que le Cambodge emploie la latérite en fortes masses, parfois énormes, elle est au Siam taillée le plus souvent en moellons de la forme et du volume d'une grosse brique. En même temps que brique et latérite sont employés avec l'aide du mortier l'enduit vient invariablement former le décor sur la maçonnerie et dans des formes le plus souvent inconnues de l'art khmer. On se demande alors pourquoi on s'acharne à considérer comme khmers des monuments qui n'ont à peu près rien de l'art contemporain ou du dernier art connu du Cambodge. Il est vrai qu'on peut dire que ce sont des

1. Ce monolithisme est réalisé par l'emploi d'un liant inconnu, sans doute végétal qui permet de constituer une masse unique évidée au besoin, quelque chose comme un arc en ciment armé. Des pans de toiture entiers en briques furent ainsi exécutés, soutenus et maintenus dans leur place par un jeu de pannes et de murs de refend.

bâtiments exécutés par des artisans inexpérimentés à l'imitation des modes khmères. L'ouvrier siamois qui a appris du Birman l'usage du mortier et l'emploi de l'enduit s'efforce avec ces moyens de traduire l'esprit des monuments splendides du Cambodge. Il faudrait en ce cas reconnaître qu'il y réussit bien mal et le fait est plus extraordinaire encore quand on songe aux merveilles de grâce qu'il exécute en ce temps dans un esprit différent d'une part, et d'autre part que les modèles étaient à côté dans une jeune splendeur que des siècles d'abandon à l'oeuvre destructrice de la forêt n'ont pu encore détruire. On s'étonne alors que le riche fondateur n'ait pas fait venir du pays voisin les fils des ouvriers qui ont bâti les merveilles d'Añkor. Bien plus, comment expliquer le fait suivant? L'art du Bâyon montre un décor en surface continue où les frises extrêmes disparaissent dans le manteau de ciselure. Cet art pseudo-khmèr tire tout l'effet de son parement, toujours et partout, du grand blanc qui sépare et met en valeur ces deux splendides frises. Et cependant rien mieux que l'enduit ne permettait de réaliser cette trame continue de décor qui a ravi le créateur Khmèr.

Le passage du *prāsāt* au *prang* considéré comme l'évolution normale de l'art khmèr me semble présenter aussi, de graves difficultés. Il existe, il est vrai, dans l'art khmèr classique avant la période du Bâyon un monument qui semble appeler le *prang*. Ce sont les tours d'Añkor Vât avec la forme en obus de leurs superstructures et le gonflement des faces qui amène la section à une masse en carré convexe intermédiaire entre la tour carrée de l'origine parfois dépourvue de fausses-portes et le plan redenté du *prang* qui finit par s'inscrire dans un cercle, à l'occasion dans un losange (fig. 5). Or la tour d'Añkor Vât est un accident dans l'art khmèr et le génial architecte qui créa le monument n'a pas fait école: l'art de Jayavarman VII reprend la tradition normale quand il n'a pas recours au vénérable motif si étrange mais si décoratif des grandes faces d'Avalokitéçvara. La forme propre de l'art khmèr accuse le

carré et même les chapelles isolées comme le Tà Prohm Kël gardent au milieu du quadruple décor de leurs baies




Figure 5

vraie ou fausses le plan carré à peine bombé par les redents. Rien ne permet donc à mon sens d'affirmer que si l'art khmèr de maçonnerie avait pu poursuivre son évolution sur place, il fut finalement parvenu au *prang*.

Comment rendre compte de ces difficultés si, comme il semble par ailleurs presque évident et comme maints détails de soubassement, de frontons, d'étages le prouvent clairement, il faut admettre le rapport du *prang* siamois avec le pràsàt *khmèr*? Laissons de côté le problème; nous y reviendrons par un détour.

Les pays d'Extrême-Orient civilisés par l'Inde autres que le Siam offrent tous un tableau plus franc. En général, dans chacun d'eux, on voit, en matière d'art, la culture indienne s'installer, s'épanouir en un art original par le mélange avec les tendances locales, puis s'effacer devant le triomphe de celles-ci et l'architecture, perdant l'usage des

matières durables, retourner aux constructions légères indigènes où seuls quelques motifs persistants marquent la longue influence passagère. C'est l'histoire de Java, de la Birmanie, du *Campā*, du Cambodge. Au Siam, peut-être par suite d'un trop grand mélange initial de races ou par la succession des invasions l'influence indienne plus pure et plus nette parfois qu'ailleurs n'arriva jamais à créer un art robuste original et un, et la statuaire qui est à peu près seule à fournir un tableau clair offre seulement une série d'écoles successives presque indépendantes.

En architecture existe la même étrange variété. Le *vihara* léger à étages superposés indien dont nous connaissons les images aux grottes bouddhiques de l'Inde a donné dans sa traduction en Extrême-Orient tout une série de systèmes. Le plus répandu est celui où l'étage inférieur prend toute l'importance et réduit les autres *A* soit à des éléments moindres chargés de *stūpa* en coupole ou en cloche (Java), soit *B* à une succession de gradins semblables qui répètent l'étage principal en s'amenuisant en pyramide (*Campā* et Cambodge), ou *C* portant une pyramide d'étages minuscules; formule qu'on retrouve en plusieurs points et qui semble avoir été l'architecture préférée du Fou-nan. *D*, un autre système, plus naturel et plus près sans doute du modèle lointain ne donne la prépondérance à aucun étage, mais les empile successivement en les réduisant à peine, forme spéciale que les pays de civilisation indienne montrent peu mais qui a fait fortune au contraire dans ceux de famille chinoise: c'est la "pagode" classique, la Tour de porcelaine de Nankin et tant d'autres, en Chine, au Japon, en Corée et celle-là même qui, connue par d'innombrables débris de modèles du XIII^e siècle vient d'être retrouvée en pied au Tonkin (tour de Bính-sôn, *BE. XXXIII*, pl. XXXII).

Il est curieux de constater que toutes ces versions, séparées ailleurs, se rencontrent ensemble au Siam, au moins en modèles souvent récents mais qu'il n'est pas bien hardi de supposer copies de témoins plus anciens

disparus. *D* : l'édifice en superposition d'étages nous est donnée en plusieurs cas, soit d'allure ancienne comme les tours du W. Kūkut de C'iang Mai (Cl. pl. LXXXII-LXXXIII) et celle du W. Māhāth'āt de Lāmp'un (Cl. pl. LXXXIV) ou plus récents immense tour octogonale du W. Māhāth'āt d'Ayūthia (pl. II B à gauche), *th'āt* du W. Suon Dōk de C'iang māi (*Doc.* pl. VI A). Le système C plus rare est représenté par un *th'at* du W. Cedi Cet Thēu de Qri S'atc'ānalāi (Cl. pl. LXXIII A au fond, vers le milieu) et par divers autres *that* dont je n'ai pas d'images. Le mode *B*. est montré par le premier édifice examine ici du W. Suon Dōk de C'iang Mai (pl. I A), les édifices intérieurs du W. P'rā Sing Luóng de la même ville (Cl. pl. CXII) ou du W. P'rā Th'āt Lāmpang Luóng (*Doc.* pl. I C) construit en 1591. Le plus vénérable peut-être A est représenté par les charmants édifices de Ligor et de C'āiya (Cl. pl. XXXVIII, XXXIX) et par d'autres plus récents comme le W. P'rā Yun de Lāmp'un (Cl. pl. LXXXVII) ou le *th'at* du W. P'rā Cedi Luóng (Cl. pl. LXXXVIII C). Je ne parle pas du simple *stūpa* dont on a des exemples de toutes les formes possibles, depuis la plus sobre comme le second édifice du W. Māhāth'āt de Sukhót'āi (Cl. pl. LXX) jusqu'aux plus fins ou aux plus compliqués qu'on rencontre dans tous les clichés qui se rapportent au Siam, voire les plus extraordinaires comme celui du W. Ku Tau (Cl. pl. LXXXVIII A) de C'iang Mai, fusion peut-être de la tour à étages A et de l'idée du *stūpa* en coupole, agrémenté de portes inattendues.

On sent ainsi la folle variété des germes qui ont été déposés sur la terre du Siam soit directement en des points divers, soit par influence des pays voisins fécondés plus tôt ou autrement. Mais on est étonné aussi du travail énorme réalisé sur place dans l'évolution de toutes ces formes. L'absence d'une résultante unique et qui fixe l'esprit empêche de sentir l'effort considérable qui s'est produit continument en ce pays. Et rien n'est plus frappant que de voir à une date sans doute pas très lointaine,

peut-être le XIII^e siècle une version de clôture de temple d'apparence aussi follement ancienne que celle du W. Māhāth'āt de Sāvank 'ālok que mon ami Claeys compare très justement au "rail" du *stūpa* de Sānchi. C'est une suite d'énormes blocs de latérite circulaires plantés verticalement en terre l'un contre l'autre comme des pieux, sous un chaperon en coupe de toit angulaire; ce mur est percé de portes doubles faites de 3 pièces analogues mais plus importantes encore; elles soutiennent deux formidables masses qui à l'extrémité s'élargissent en deux minces pignons et au centre reçoivent une nouvelle pierre qui porte un pyramidion en losange ciselé en édicule (pl. V A et Cl. pl. LXXI B et C). Et cette disposition extraordinaire n'est pas unique; on retrouve quelque chose d'approchant au moins en deux autres *wāt*: des enceintes en cylindres de latérite au W. Ćedi Ćet Thēu de la même ville et au W. Xetuphon de Sukhot'āi, une troisième en pièces de schiste au Ćet Thēu.

On ne sait alors jamais en présence des formes inattendues qu'on rencontre à quelle origine peut-être très lointaine il faut les rapporter, si l'évolution n'est pas purement locale ou s'il faut chercher quelque modèle étranger. Ainsi de l'étrange bâtiment carré réduit aujourd'hui aux quatre murs du W. Trāp'āng T'ōng Lāng de Sukhot'āi et de ses splendides portes. C'est le bas d'une tour carrée en briques abritant un *buddha* assis énorme, complètement ruiné. L'édifice offre en avant l'ébrasement de la porte et une fausse-porte se dresse sur chaque face entre les arêtes franches et lisses. La fausse-porte, large, est à deux plans avec motif d'arc en U renversé nervé. Le corps du rampant plat mouluré se retrousse en crosse de décors peu distincts. La porte traitée de même est plus saillante. Le second plan offre un fronton assez bas et ainsi presque en angle droit; les crosses ici paraissent des *nāga*. Les fausses-portes encadrent des panneaux d'enduit d'un décor remarquable mais qui ont beaucoup de chances d'être moins anciens que la construction même

et ses décors architecturaux. Claeys, p. 416, les rapproche de décors de même nature au W. Côt Yôt de ĕ'iang Măi qu'il croit également postérieur au monument qui les porte, double hypothèse qui me paraît exacte. A la fausse-porte N. le Buddha debout devant une orbe de sa hauteur a les pieds sur un piédestal circulaire ; il est accompagné par Ananda, sur un fond de rinceaux (Cl. pl. LXXVI A). Sur la face postérieure O., la niche est occupée par le Buddha debout marchant, devant une orbe elliptique incliné ; il se détache sur un fond de nombreux personnages en prière, chacun avec une auréole (Cl. pl. LXXVI B). La fausse-porte S. abrite une scène représentant le Buddha descendant un escalier ; il est accompagné d'une série de figures parées portant des bannières et des parasols ; le Sage, de côté, a les deux pieds sur la même marche. Il semble bien exister ici une intention réelle de perspective, non pour les degrés, mais pour les personnages (Cl. pl. LXXVI C.)

Plus déconcertant encore dans une forme bien plus évoluée et devenue plus sèche est le fronton extraordinaire de la fausse-porte S. à l'édicule E. du grand *th'at*, au W. Măhăth'at de Sukhot'ăi (pl. III A). La tête supérieure au sommet de l'arc est d'un caractère tout particulier. Le *makara* qui termine l'arc a de curieux rapports avec celui de l'art primitif khmèr et aussi avec ceux de l'Inde ancienne ; comme certains de ceux-ci, il avale l'arc : il possède une forte patte placée comme une serre d'oiseau au milieu du corps et est orné d'une grande queue qui se relevant vers le haut donne la ligne habituelle de cette composition, telle qu'elle est couramment traduite dans l'art classique khmèr par le *nāga* polycéphale, dernier avatar du *makara* initial. Disposition inattendue : la surface de l'arc est divisée en trois zones parallèles : vers l'intérieur des moulures à perles et à lotus ; au centre, un panneau long occupé par un rinceau en sinusoïde qui enferme dans chaque anse une large fleur traitée en marguerite ; l'extérieur est garni d'une rangée de feuilles retroussées d'un

caractère spécial et qui n'a rien à voir avec la feuille rampante khmère; elles se retrouvent dans les motifs finaux de l'ample queue des *makara*. La face latérale de cette crosse (F. I, pl. LXXVI) est traitée dans un tout autre esprit que facilite le jeu des enduits et le plan courbe est rempli par un beau motif de pâtisserie en rinceau double partant d'une figure féminine assise. En arrière, sur le côté de la porte principale E. vue dans le partie latérale du cliché une sorte d'antéfixe avec une figurine vient occuper le vide.


Non moins extraordinaire est l'arc d'une porte d'enceinte du W. P'ră Sadet de Lămpang qui, dans son ensemble, rentre dans la série B. Il offre une forme en plein cintre ou mieux en demi-ellipse à grand axe vertical; car d'ordinaire dans cette architecture étrange influencée sans doute par l'art birman ou souvenir d'origines communes, l'arc est libre. Sa crosse énorme est un *nāga* triple qui part vers l'extérieur derrière une gracieuse *kinnari* debout, à corps d'oiseau, figure dont la présence surprend. La fausse-baie non moins curieuse s'orne de deux têtes de *makara* disproportionnées tournées vers l'intérieur et au bas de la baie comme dans un arc indojavaçais (pl. III C).

Ces divers exemples n'ont à peu près rien de khmèr; l'impression du suivant le rattache à l'art du Cambodge, bien qu'un tel motif ne s'y rencontre jamais.

Le grand arc qui forme niche à un minuscule *buddha* dans une des salles qui s'allongent au pied du *prang* de Raj Bunah d'Ayuth'ia est une splendide ogive lobée qui ne détonnerait pas dans un monument d'Ankor; par contre il se retourne en deux crosses, tête de monstre mi-crocodile mi-*makara* qui l'avalent; leur queue retroussée est par malheur perdue. En outre, arrangement tout à fait inattendu, le même arc s'évase brusquement; il continue encore à descendre en s'élargissant en bas à nouveau et se retrousse par des motifs à ras de terre; ils sont perdus. Comme si le manieur de chaux avait voulu insister sur l'esprit khmèr de l'ogive lobée, il l'a tout



III A



III B.



III C

III A —Fronton de la fausse porte S de l'édicule 1 du
Prang du W Mahathàt de Sukhot'ai

III B —Prang du W Cen de Bangkok

III C —Parte du W P'ro Sadet de Lampang

[To face page 110]

entourée de nerveuses feuilles rampantes qu'on retrouve encore sur l'arc inférieur (pl. V B).

Un tel exemple est frappant et s'ajoutant à la série des faits réunis auparavant montre comment il faut, je crois, comprendre les rapports de l'art khmèr et de l'art siamois. De la variété des modèles d'édifice qu'on rencontre au Siam et de l'étrangeté de certain motifs de décor d'enduit d'inspiration lointaine hindoue que portent les uns et les autres, il faut déduire qu'une série complexe de courants d'art sortis de la source commune ont inondé le pays sans compter celui qui a donné l'art t'hai et ses manifestations remarquables d'art mixte au Laos et au Siam. Mais il faut encore compter avec un élément considérable qu'on néglige toujours trop dans l'étude de tous ces arts, parce que nous ne l'avons plus sous les yeux et qu'il faut l'évoquer par le raisonnement, l'emploi constant, à côté de l'édification exceptionnelle en maçonnerie robuste seule durable, de la construction légère. L'évolution de l'art censé khmèr et la naissance du *prang* me semblent alors aisés à expliquer par l'hypothèse suivante.

Au temps de sa domination sur le Siam, le Cambodge y construit toute une série de monuments dont un petit nombre en matériaux durables comme celui de P'ïmai, nous sont seuls parvenus. Celui-ci est un bel exemple d'une forme dominante, intermédiaire entre les *pràsàt* isolés précédés d'une salle de culte en construction légère des débuts et les complexes finaux de maçonnerie où cette salle lie le Saint des saints aux systèmes de salles et de galeries qui constituent le temple. Pendant une longue période qui débute à la fin du X^e siècle, le *pràsàt* est régulièrement précédé par une grande salle de maçonnerie généralement à l'imitation d'un édifice à trois nefs, vraies ou fausses. Un des premiers et des plus jolis exemples en est à Bantāy Srēi **546,2** commencé en 967 AD.; on retrouve la même disposition aux temples de Vāt Ek **861**, de Vāt Bāsèt **862**, de Phnom Cisor **23** au

temps de Sūryavarmān I; on la voit au temple de P'Ymai **447**; bien plus tard elle fleurit encore aux gracieux monuments de Čau Sāy Tévoda **489**, de Thōmmanon **490**, de Bantāy Samrè **541**, voisins dans le temps d'Añkor Vāt, c'est à dire du XII^e siècle. Une des dispositions courantes de ce système est la suivante: les portes latérales et postérieure de la tour continuent à ne pas donner accès au sanctuaire, mais un gracieux arrangement les abrite d'un porche devant lequel la porte, vraie alors, se répète à nouveau; dans l'axe un quatrième abri fait communiquer la cella avec la salle antérieure. J'ai indiqué quelques exemples; je pourrais en citer bien d'autres; mais ce peu suffit à montrer l'importance du type et la continuité de son emploi sur plusieurs siècles. Il dût fournir le plus grand nombre des édifices d'architecture légère dont le vainqueur se devait de couvrir le pays, ne pouvant que rarement faire l'effort coûteux d'un temple en maçonnerie comme P'Ymai. Or si l'on prend les exemples les plus complets et en même temps les moins siamoisés dans nos édifices pseudo-khmèrs, le *prang* central du W. Māhāthāt de Lōp'buri et l'édifice ruiné de Čulamāṇi, c'est la schématisation déjà avancée de ce type (fig. 6) la tour




Figure 6

avec ses portes fausses, résidu des porches sans accès, et son étroite nef, avec son étage, sa croisée de voûtes et

ses portes latérales, amas d'éléments qui n'ont plus aucun sens dans un si petit espace, enfin son porche extérieur avec ses fenêtres quand la porte libre suffit largement à l'éclairer. Fait nouveau, le tout est remonté sur un système de soubassements considérable; il existait dans l'art khmèr, mais bien plus modeste: il prend ici une importance dévorante par suite de la nécessité de remonter l'ensemble au dessus de l'habituel cloître dont le T'ai enserrait étroitement le sanctuaire et que nous retrouvons dans presque tous ses temples. Avec l'indépendance d'esprit née chez le Siamois de la multiplicité des courants d'art qui ont sillonné le pays, il ne s'est pas reporté servilement au modèle; d'ailleurs nombre de réparations d'enduit avait déjà du le défigurer. Le type initial par suite a dû rapidement se déformer et se simplifier et le désaxement des portes latérales de la nef marque la disparition de la cellule de jonction, de règle dans l'art khmèr et dont on trouve la trace nette à l'intérieur du plan de Lōp'buri. Dans l'aspect extérieur le beau parti de grands nus qui s'établit dans nombre d'exemples cambodgiens et qu'on trouve à P'Ymai, s'impose dans ces constructions avec les frises ornementales qui encadrent le sobre parement et le mettent en valeur; mais leur dessin même a dû changer dès les premières copies.

De tous ces exemples élevés au Siam en construction légère, rien n'a pu se conserver et les premiers termes de l'évolution qui nous apparaissent sont ceux qu'a fixés la traduction en laterite de l'édifice léger lorsque, lassés d'avoir toujours à reprendre les bâtiments en construction légère, les Siamois se sont avisés de remplacer l'ossature de bois trop fragile par une maçonnerie de matériaux durables hourdés au mortier birman. La brique était sans doute encore trop difficile à se procurer ou trop coûteuse: on la remplace économiquement par des moëllons de latérite taillés dans la dimension de cette brique même, fait invraisemblable mais absolument sûr

et dont les exemples sont nombreux. Dès lors le bâtiment peut se maintenir jusqu'à nous et l'évolution devient fort claire grâce aux quelques étapes dont nous avons gardé les témoins. La rapidité de la transformation continue qui s'avère ainsi rend très vraisemblables les modifications antérieures à peine plus fortes.

Culamāṇi tend à perdre les fenêtres du porche de la nef, Raj Bunah et P'utth'aisāvān n'ont plus de vestibule et les portes latérales de la nef deviennent fausses ; elles disparaissent au *prang* de Ràtburi ; la nef antérieure se réduit à un avant-corps modeste au *prang* du W. Māhāth-
'āt de Sāvānk'ālòk pour s'effacer complètement devant celui de P'iṣṇulòk.¹ Bien entendu je ne dis pas que ces exemples dans leur forme actuelle se sont succédé rigoureusement dans cet ordre, mais ils donnent, pour moi, une série claire des étapes de l'évolution. On ne doit cependant pas être très loin de la vérité parce que la transformation du *pràsūt* en *prang* semble marcher dans ces exemples de pair avec les transformations de la salle antérieure. Le premier cas accuse encore nettement l'arête du carré entre les fausses-baies comme il marque le souvenir de la cellule de jonction ; l'édifice est seulement un peu trop étiré pour un *prasat* ordinaire. Le 3° et le 4° tendent déjà à noyer l'arête du carré, réduisent les fausses-baies et perdent même les lotus supérieurs ; le 5° n'a plus de fausses-baies et les remplace chaque fois par une énorme antéfixe ; le 6° en marque encore un vague souvenir, mais l'arête principale compte encore moins et elle s'est complètement effacée dans le dernier. L'étage terminal en lotus, encore sensible au début se perd vite, le nombre des étages passe de 5 à 7 ou plus et les antéfixes s'allongent et prennent chaque fois plus d'importance en même temps qu'elles se simplifient et que celles du haut se renversent en arrière, ramenant la masse générale à la courbe continue que perce seulement le *navaçula* final.

1. Cf. *Bulletin de la commission archéologique de l'Indochine*, 1909 pl. V fig. 14.



V. A.—W. Maháth'at de Savankalok: "rail" du Prang V B.—Raj Bunah d'Ayuthia: Salle près du Prang: arc

[To face page 114]

Cette étude nous permet-elle d'entrevoir avec un peu plus de précision la date de ces divers monuments; en raison des difficultés mentionnées au début, il n'est pas inutile de le rechercher.

Les bâtiments que nous admettons comme khmèrs se placent vraisemblablement autour du XII^e siècle, accidentellement sans doute plus haut, comme le Pr. Ban Si; il est peu probable que ils soient sensiblement postérieurs; cessant de construire en maçonnerie au pays d'origine, il serait invraisemblable que rois ou grands seigneurs aient utilisé ces modes coûteux dans des pays excentriques.

Nous avons quelques dates, utilisables avec les réserves précédentes pour les autres; elles paraissent assez bien s'accorder avec l'évolution supposée. Cūlamāṇi serait du roi Paramatrailokanātha, c'est à dire du milieu du XV^e siècle; le *prang* de P'isṇulòk de 1482, soit de la fin; l'écart entre les deux époques semble faible pour l'importance des transformations et l'on serait tenté de discuter l'une ou l'autre de ces dates; mais la première est de fondation et il est par suite impossible de la reculer pour l'édifice existant; pour le second bâtiment ce sont ses caractéristiques mêmes de masse qui le font sentir si évolué: on ne peut en appeler à aucune modification postérieure qui n'eût porté que sur les décors. S'il faut, donc comme je le pense, admettre ces deux dates, on devrait en conclure que l'évolution, lente d'abord s'est précipitée vers la fin et c'est là un fait assez fréquent. Par suite le *prang* de Lōp'buri qui semble se placer avant Cūlamāṇi devrait sans doute le précéder de fort peu; le placer au début du XV^e siècle semblerait la plus haute ancienneté à lui attribuer. Il faudrait alors admettre que la transformation du bâtiment khmèr initial en construction légère, edifice d'usage courant au XIII^e siècle aurait demandé près de 300 ans avant d'en venir au type de Lōp'buri pour s'achever ensuite en moins d'un siècle.

En résumé et pour préciser les éléments de ce long article, l'édifice siamois né d'une forme khmère en cons-

truction légère importée par le vainquer, identique dans son aspect extérieur à celle qui donna en maçonnerie de grès les monuments de Thommanon au Cambodge, de P'ïmai au Siam; puis, sans aucun apport khmér nouveau il eut ensuite évolué en construction légère au Siam seulement et se fut fixé en maçonnerie grossière à revêtement d'enduit au XV^e siècle, comme le montrent les pagodes du Wät Mahath'at de Lăpb'ūri et de Čulamăṇi; il se serait alors transformé rapidement sans doute par une marche parallèle dans les deux systèmes de construction et eut donné finalement au XVI^e siècle le *prang* purement siamois.

Une telle hypothèse a un autre intérêt que de nous faire mieux comprendre comment les faits ont dû se passer; elle relève en plus l'art siamois de l'étrange anomalie de n'avoir créé aucune forme type et emprunté ses seuls monuments importants aux arts voisins. Comme nous avons une architecture mixte et légère t'āi des mieux constituées et du plus haut intérêt, voisine comme lignes des architectures correspondantes au Cambodge et en Birmanie mais toutefois très distincte, nous dégageons ainsi une architecture robuste bien siamoise et qui n'aurait comme tous ces arts d'Extrême-Orient qu'un point de départ étranger, moins lointain que ceux des autres arts en ces pays mais datant encore de plusieurs siècles: elle eut réalisé une forme entièrement nouvelle, le *prang*, à une époque où les arts les plus glorieux d'Extrême-Orient tombaient en décadence ou en sommeil.

Phnom Penh

Table des Illustrations

Planches hors-texte

		Après la page
Pl. I	A—Vue de l'édifice rajouté au <i>vihan</i> de Suon Dōk de Č'ieng Măi ...	11
	B— <i>Prang</i> du Raj Bunah d'Ayūth'ia ...	17
Pl. II	A—Tours de Sisávai à Sūkhót'ăi ...	13
	B— .. du W. Măhath'ăt d'Āyūth'ia ...	13
III	A—Fronton de la fausse-porte S. de l'édicule E. du <i>prang</i> du W. Măhath' ăt de Sūkhót'ăi ...	110
	B— <i>Prang</i> du W. Čen de Bangkok ...	110
	C—Porte du W. P'ră Sadet de Lămpang ...	110
IV	A—Edifice de Čulamăni à P'isṇūlòk: côte du porche ...	21
	B— partie de fausse-porte ...	23
V	A—W. Măhath'ăt de Săvăn'ălòk: "rail" du <i>prang</i> ...	114
	B—Raj Bunah d'Ayūth'ia: salle près du <i>prang</i> : arc ...	114

Figures dans le texte

		Page
Fg. I	Plan de l'édifice rajouté au <i>vihan</i> de W. Suon Dōk de Č'ieng Măi ...	11
2	Profil du même ...	11
3	Tour du W. Măhath'ăt de Lōp 'būri: plan ...	18
4	Edifice de Čulamăni à P'isṇūlòk: profil de corniche ...	24
5	Divers plans des <i>pràsāt</i> et <i>prang</i> ...	105
6	Porte du W. P'ră Sadet de Lămpang: fausse-baie ...	112

A New Inscription from Fu-Nan

BY DR. G. ÇOEDES

Mon. R. Dalet, Correspondent of the French School of the Far East in Cambodia, has just discovered a group of vestiges of primitive Khmèr art in the Province of Treang.¹ This group comprises, among some fragments of sculpture of mediocre interest, an inscription incised upon a plaque of schist.

This inscription (Pl. XI) consists of eighteen lines in Sanskrit, forming five stanzas (4 *Śārdūlavikṛīḍita* and 1 *Śloka*). From the seventh line the last characters of each *pāda* are much effaced or completely illegible.

The text relates to the foundation of a hermitage (*ārāma*) with a tank (*taṭāka*) and a dwelling-house (*ālaya*) by Queen Kulaprabhāvatī, the principal spouse of a king called Jayavarman.

With which Jayavarman are we concerned here? In the absence of dates, the palaeography of the inscription permits us to answer that it is a king of Fu-nan who reigned at the end of the 5th century A.D.

At first sight this inscription is remarkable for the general archaism of its script. On closer inspection and after comparing it with the two inscriptions of Fu-nan at present known,² it may be concluded that it presents all the palaeographical characteristics that permit us to attribute

1 The place whence comes this inscription is called Neak Ta Dambang Dêk; it is a dependency of the village of Khvao, situated in the district of Prei Sandék and is found 200 m. north of the Buddhist monastery of Vat Somavodei. The province of Treang, in the south of Cambodia, is rich enough in vestiges of primitive or pre-Angkorite period.

2 Inscription of Guṇavarman at Tháp-muôi (Cochin China) and of Rudravarman at Bati (*BEFEO.*, XXXI, p. 1).

these two texts to a period anterior to the middle of the 6th century A. D.: traces of box-heads at the top of the *aḥṣaras*, inequality of the two lower strokes of *ra*, special form of lingual *na* which is distinguished from dental *na* only by the two divergent strokes of the upper extremity of this character, brevity of the left lower stroke of *ga*, crossing as in *x* of the lower strokes of *ma*. Most of these characteristics, with the exception of inequality of the lower strokes of *ra*, are sporadically found in the inscriptions of Bhavavarman I and Mahendravarman (second half of the 6th century) and even of Īśānavarman I (first half of the 7th century).³ But they are never found together as is the case here, and above all they do not survive down to the reign of Jayavarman I (second half of the 7th century). Besides, the province where this new inscription has been found has already given us several inscriptions anterior to Jayavarman I, which no longer present any of these palaeographical archaisms. Such are the inscription of Bhavavarman I at Ponhea Hor,⁴ the stèle of Īśānavarman I at Vat Pô,⁵ and the inscriptions of Īśānavarman I and Bhavavarman (II?) at Phnom Bayang.⁶

The script of this new inscription from Fu-nan is nearer that of Guṇavarman dating at the latest from the second half of the 5th century, than that of Rudravarman who is posterior to 614 A. D., the date of his accession.⁷ To take one point which may be considered as crucial, the form of the *ra*, the new inscription clearly marks an intermediate stage between the two preceding inscriptions.


3 In an additional note (*BEFEO.*, XXXI, p. 695) I have shown that the archaic form of *na* survived even under Īśānavarman I, but it seems to have completely disappeared under Jayavarman I.

4 Published by A. Barth, *Inscriptions sanskrites du Cambodge*, p. 21 (No. II).

5 *Ibid.*, p. 47 (No. VIII).

6 *Ibid.*, p. 31 (No. V) and G. Cœdès, *Inscriptions du Cambodge*, Hanoi, 1937, p. 252, pl. CCLXXX.

7 P. Pelliot, *Le Fou-nan*, *BEFEO.*, III, p. 294.



Inscription of Jayavarman

(En-nan, Cambodia)

[To face page 118]

In the inscription of Guṇavarman, the left lower stroke of *ra* is generally shorter than the right one, and where it has the same height, it terminates at the top with a slender stroke which does not cling to the box-head surmounting the right lower stroke. In the inscription of Rudravarman, the character *ra* has two lower strokes equal and united at the top by a horizontal stroke derived from the ancient box-head. Now, in the new inscription we come across the two forms: the form with unequal lower strokes appears six times (line 1: *kṣīroda*; l. 3: *ambhoruho*; l. 7: *nagare*; l. 8: *racitaṃ*; l. 9: *rudrāṇi, harasya*); and the form with equal lower strokes appears nine times (l. 2: *racanā*; l. 4: *rājñīm, rakṣatu*; l. 6: *drṣṭir*; l. 7: *kurumba*; l. 10: *rahite* l. 15: *rājñāś, priyatarā*; l. 18: *ārāmaṃ*). This intermediate position of the inscription of Jayavarman of Fu-nan is precisely what may be expected of a document going back to the reign of the predecessor of Rudravarman.

If my deductions are correct, and if the inscription discovered by Mon. Dalet in the province of Treang dates actually from Jayavarman of Fu-nan, it is probable that its author, the great queen, the principal spouse of a king, is the person whose son was turned out for the benefit of Rudravarman, the elder son born of a concubine.⁸ Just like the palaeography, the Viṣṇuite character of the document connects it with the inscription of Guṇavarman and separates it from the Buddhist inscription of Rudravarman. We are, therefore, justified in asking whether this Guṇavarman, son of the king, who was still young when this inscription was composed,⁹ was not the legitimate heir of Jayavarman and was subsequently turned out for the benefit of his elder brother, but this is only a possibility which I content myself with indicating *en passant*.

8 *Ibid.*

9 Cf. stanza VII of the inscription of Tháp-Muôi.

TEXT

- I. (1) yuñjan yogam atarkitañ kam api ya[h*]kṣīroda-
śaiyyāgrhe¹⁰
(2) śete śeṣabhujāṅgabhogaracanāparyyañkapṛṣṭhā-
śritaḥ
(3) k[u]kṣiprāntasamāśritatribhuvano nābhyutthitām-
bhoruho
(4) r [āj]ñ [īṃ]¹¹ śrījayavarmmaṇo¹² gramahiṣiṃ sa
svāminīṃ rakṣatu||
- II. (5) kulaprabhāvatī nāmnā prabhāvāt kulavarddhinī
(6) dṛṣṭir ekeva yā dṛṣṭā jayena jayavarmmaṇā ||
- III. (7) viprāṇāṃ bhavanaṃ kurumbanagare prā - - - -
- - - -
(8) kṛtvā yāṃ prātimāṃ suvarṇnaracitām - - - -
(9) kāryyānāṃ vyasane nimagnamanas - - - -
(10) bhoge saty api naiva bhāgarahite - - - -
- IV. (11) śakrasyeva śaci nṛpasya dayitā svāhe [va] sapta
[rcciṣaḥ]
(12) vudrāṇīva harasya lokaviditā sā śrīr iva śrīpateḥ
(13) bhūyas saṅgatam icchatī nṛpatinā śrī- - - -¹³
(14) laulyaṃ vikṣya bhuvi śrīyās ca bahudhā cā - - - -
- - - -
- V. (15) rājñās śrījayavarmmaṇa¹⁴ priyatarā e - - - -
(16) kṛtvā bandhujānañ ca saukhyasahitaṃ vi - - - -
(17) jñātvā bhogam anityabudbudasamaṃ sa - - - -
(18) ārāmaṃ sataṭākam ālayayutaṃ - - - -

TRANSLATION

- I. May he who, absorbed in undesigned meditation,
reposes in the sleeping-chamber which is the Ocean
of milk, lying upon the bed which is the arrangement

10 Read °śaiyyā°

11 One rather expects *rājñās*, but the ś of *śrī* being single, *rājñīṃ* is the only possible restoration.

12 [The sign for *avagraha* does not appear.—Ed.]

13 The last character is almost certainly a *na*. The lost name could not be Jayavarman which does not suit the metre.

14 [Does the complex character stand for the *upadhmānīyaḥ*? Ed.]

- of curl of the serpent Śeṣa, may he who gathered the three worlds within the bounds of his stomach and who has a lotus springing from his navel, protect the great queen, the principal spouse of Śrī Jayavarman.
- II. By name Kulaprabhāvatī, making her family (*kuḷa*) prosper through her majesty (*prabhāvāt*), she was prized by Jayavarman as the only doctrine on account of his victory (over others).
- III. ...an abode of Brāhmaṇas in the town of Kurumba... having made an image adorned with gold.....with the mind plunged in the ill-success of actions.....even then there was enjoyment, not devoid of happiness.
- IV. Reputed in the world as the spouse of the king, as Śacī is that of Śakra, Svāhā is that of Fire, Rudrāṇī of Hara, and Śrī of Śrīpati, ardently desiring her union with the king Śrī....., having many times considered the inconstancy of Śrī on earth.....
- V. Dearer to the king Śrī Jayavarman.....having taken for her friend and being filled with happiness..... having realised that enjoyment is like an ephemeral bubble.....(she built) a hermitage with a tank and a dwelling house.....

Hanoi

(Translated by U. N. Ghoshal)

Three Indo-Javanese Gaṅgā Images

By DR. F. M. SCHNITGER

In the art of North India the images of the river-goddesses Gaṅgā and Yamunā occupy an important place. During the Middle Ages and even many centuries after the Muhammadan conquest temple gates were decorated with these images, while the Buddhists also placed them in their shrines.

During the late Middle Ages images of Gaṅgā, designed for independent worship, are met with chiefly in the plains of the Lower Ganges. The *Tantras* adopted and established the worship of Gaṅgā as a goddess by formulating its ritual. Gaṅgā was to be recognized and represented as the ultimate goal of salvation (*Paramā gatiḥ*) in a country noted for accurate philosophical thought and for a knowledge of the real sources of salvation in accordance therewith.


According to Akshay Kumār Maitra, who devoted a fine article to this subject in *Rūpam* (1921), this development evidently took place in the Tāntrika region and coincided approximately with the late mediaeval art of the Gauḍian Empire of Bengal. Royal grants of the Pāla kingdom show that while the capital was transferred from one place to another, it was always located on the Ganges or in its vicinity. It is this age and the zone influenced by the culture of this kingdom which have given us the best examples of the Gaṅgā image intended for special worship.

It is less well-known that Gaṅgā images also occur in Indo-Javanese art. In this article are published two illustrations (Pls. XIV and XV) of a very beautiful Gaṅgā image found in Papar, Kediri (East Java). It is four-armed and carries in the upper right hand extending backwards a *liṅga* on a lotus, in the upper left a fly-fan, in the lower



Gaṅgā
(British Museum, London)

[To face page 122]



Gaṅgā
(Musée Guimet, Paris)

[To face page 122]



A — Gaṅgā
(Papar, Java)



B Gaṅgā
(Papar, Java)

[To face page 122]

right a rosary and in the lower left a *kumbha*. Back of the feet lies a crocodile with lifted tail.

Thirteen years ago Dr. Stutterheim called attention to a Javanese Gaṅgā image in the British Museum, London, and another in the Musée Guimet, Paris.¹ Photos of these remarkable antiquities are here reproduced for the first time (Pls. XII and XIII).²

When these images are compared, it becomes evident that all three originated in East Java and were made probably during the 14th century. On the pedestal of the London image a few figures are still faintly visible, which Dr. Stutterheim interpreted as 128. The image was thus made between 1358 and 1368 A. D.

The Papar image far surpasses the other two in beauty. The latter represent a thin, emaciated goddess standing on a crocodile, between two tall lotus stems. The London figure has also a crude halo.

Apparently these three are death-images, considered as appropriate resting-places for the redeemed souls on account of their relation to the Ganges, the mighty river of the dead, which opens the way to celestial bliss.

According to Maitra, the worship of Gaṅgā with clay image still prevails in Bengal, preserving a continuity which has disappeared from Orissa and other neighbouring provinces. I would also call attention to the fact that two bronze images of the goddess, with a crocodile, which also evidently represent Gaṅgā, have been found in Nālandā³ and elsewhere⁴.

The first mention of the name Gaṅgā is in the rock ins-

1 *App. Royal Institute*, 1924, pp. 296, 298.

2 For permission to publish these photos, I am indebted to the courtesy of the Netherlands-Indies Archaeological Service, the British Museum and the Musée Guimet.

3 *Ann. Progress Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, Central Circle*, 1920-21, p. 47.

4 Bhattasali, *Iconography of Buddhist and Brahmanical Sculptures in the Dacca Museum*, pp. 199-200, 273, ill. LXVII f.

cription of Tuk Mas on the mountain Merbabu (Middle Java), chiselled about the year 650. It appears next in the Sañjaya inscription of 732.⁵ An East Java inscription of 1486 mentions a priest, Gaṅgādhara⁶; it is possible that his wife is immortalized in the London or the Paris image. The Papar image is so large and so beautiful that it must represent a queen.

Leiden

5 *JGIS.*, 1936, pp. 172-173,

6 Krom, *Hindoe-Javaansche Geschiedenis*, p. 450.

Two Bodhisattva Images from Ceylon and Śrīvijaya

By Devaprasad Ghosh

Sometime ago while dealing with the sources of the art of Śrī-Vijaya, in the pages of this *Journal*, I had hoped further discoveries would illumine the complex but fascinating problem of Greater Indian art.¹

Recently a striking image of Bodhisattva (Pl. XVI, fig. 1) has been discovered on the site of an ancient monastery called Situlpavuva in Ceylon.² My previous arguments in favour of South Indian influence on certain works of art found in Palembang, Sumatra, will, now I believe, appear conclusive to scholars after a study of this new and convincing graphic document.

A comparison between the Ceylonese image and another from Palembang³ (Pl. XVI, fig. 2) will be profitable in this connection. The material and iconography are the same. Both of them are standing stone statues in the round and the weathered miniature effigy of the Buddha represented in the head dresses of both figures help us in identifying them as images of the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara. There is again a close identity in style illustrated by the elongated head-dress, rectangular outline of the faces marked by fleshy cheeks, heavy chins and straight lines of the forehead, broad sloping shoulders and expanding chest, narrow waist gliding imperceptibly into tapering hips and smooth slim lower limbs. Both of them are characterised by general suppleness, extreme simplicity and inherent vigour. The stiffness and rigi-

1 *JGIS.*, Vol. III, No. 1, p. 56.

2 S. Paranavitana, *Recent Archaeological Work in Ceylon, Indian Arts and Letters*, Vol. XI, No. 1; Pl. II, fig. (a).

3 *Annual Bibliography, Kern Institute*, 1931; Pl. XII, d.

dity of pose has been cleverly relieved by a pleasing emphasis on curves which are more pronounced and undulating in the Ceylonese example. The Sumatran parallel is slightly thick-set and the face a little heavy and flat with eyes downcast. However, if we leave out the faces, whose peculiarities are due to the difference of the racial stamp, the similarity of treatment of the rest of the body, even to minute details e.g. the clinging transparent drapery with wavy fringe and angular corners is remarkable to a degree in both examples.

In my previous papers on "*The Early Art of Śrī-Vijaya*"⁴ and "*The Sources of the Art of Śrī-Vijaya*"⁵ I have attempted to show the apparent influence of the Pallava art of South India on the Palembang Bodhisattva. Dr. R. C. Majumdar, while discussing the stylistic connections of this particular image, remarked: "In opposition to the views of Dr. Bosch and Dr. Krom that Southern India exercised no influence of any importance on the art of Śrī-Vijaya, Mr. Ghosh holds that this image of Avalokiteśvara is almost an echo of the monumental Pallava reliefs of the 7th century at Māmallapuram. Here, again, the resemblance is only superficial. The figure is no doubt a remarkable one and possesses certain traits of classic Gupta art.....it is premature to draw any definite conclusions about the particular school from which it originated."⁶

Now let us see what Mr. Paranavitana thinks of the Ceylonese Bodhisattva. "The image is interesting", he observes, "both from the artistic and the iconographic points of view, and must be classed among the best products of Sinhalese plastic artIn style the sculpture shows affinities with the Pallava school of art."⁷

In the case of the Sumatran Bodhisattva, except for the down-cast eyes, Gupta traits are conspicuous by their absence.

4 *J.G.I.S.*, Vol. I, No. I, pp. 31-38.

5 *Ibid.*, Vol. III, No. I, pp. 50-56.

6 R. C. Majumdar, *Origin of the Art of Śrī-Vijaya*, *JISOA.*, June, 1935, p. 77.

7 *Indian Arts and Letters*, Vol. XI, No. I, p. 28.



1. Bodhisattva
(Situlpavuva, Ceylon)



2. Bodhisattva
(Palembang, Sumatra)

[By courtesy of Arch. Surv. of Ceylon]

[To face page 126]

TWO BODHISATTVA IMAGES FROM CEYLON & ŚRIVIJAYA 127

Modelling is perceptibly flat and subdued in both the sculptures from Ceylon and Sumatra in contrast to classic Gupta idiom; while the peculiar clear-cut definition of features characterising Gupta plasticity is also missing.

Such profound kinship between the Bodhisattvas from the two islands, is due probably to their having been influenced by the same common source of art, *viz.*, the Pallava School. But it is more likely that the Sumatran sculpture was inspired by direct contact with the Ceylonese prototypes.

Calcutta University

COMMENT & CRITICISM

Siddhayātrā

By. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri

The expression *Siddhayātrā* occurs in five inscriptions from Indonesia and has given rise to not a little discussion. We may note the contexts in which this expression occurs before proceeding to discuss the different interpretations of its significance.

1. In the inscription of Nhan-biêu the phrase occurs twice in verses 8 and 11 which we read as follows :

VIII. *Yavadvīpapuram bhūpānujñāto nūtakarmmaṇi
gatvā yaḥ pratipattisthaḥ siddhayātrām samāgamat
Ato vibhavasampadam adhigatavān iti*

XI. *Yavadvīpapureṃ bhūyaḥ kṣitipānujñayā — —
dvivāram api yo gatvā siddhayātrām upāgamat
Ato yasmimś ca śrī Bhadravarmmāvanibhujo.....kṣamā-
yās Sudān Kumuvēl kṣetrāṇi yo' dhigatavān iti*¹

2. In the well-known inscription of Mahānāvika Buddhagupta from the Wellesley Province of the Malaya Peninsula, we have the following line as read by Dr. B. Ch. Chhabra :

*Sarveṇa prakāreṇa sarvasmīn sarvathā
sarva.....siddhayātrāḥ santu.*²

3. In the inscription of Keḍukan Bukit (Palembang) we have the expression *mañalap siddhayātra* and *Śrī Vijaya-jayasiddhayātrā subhikṣa*.

4. In the fragmentary inscription from Koṭakapūr (Baṅka)³ we have only the letters *Jayasiddha*.

1 BEFEO., 1911., p. 303.

2 Expansion of Indo-Aryan culture during Pallava rule as evidenced from inscriptions, JASB., Letters, Vol. 1, 1935.

3 BEFEO., 1930, p. 59.

5. Lastly in a number of inscribed loose stones discovered by F. M. Schnitger in 1935 at Telaga Batu (Palembang) we have the expression *Jayasiddhayātra sarva-satva*.

Hüber in editing the Nhan-biêu inscription translated the expression *siddhayātrām upāgamat* by 'acquired the science of magic' (acquérir la science magique). Dr. Majumdar⁴ considered this translation 'far-fetched' and offered the translation 'obtained credit by the success of his undertaking.' Çœdès in his edition of the Keḍukan Bukit inscription adopted Hüber's view and translated *siddhayātra* by 'puissance magique,' and put forward a tentative suggestion that it was a magical ritual accompanying a declaration of political independence and compared it with the phrase *apāsta bali bandhana* of the inscription of Jayavarman II of Kambuja.⁵ He also said: "*siddhayātra*, more correctly *siddhiyātra*,⁶ designates a voyage or pilgrimage from which one returns endowed with supernatural powers. It is this sense which the word has in the inscription of Nhan-biêu and also in the inscription of Keḍukan Bukit according to which the king embarked on a boat for acquiring magical power in a place which unfortunately the text does not specify."⁷

Krom in his *Hindoe-Javaansche Geschiedenis*⁸ also accepted the interpretation that the *siddhayātrā* of the king of Śrī Vijaya was the journey (in a boat) for obtaining magical power, and he suggested that this *siddhayātrā* related to the foundation of the kingdom of Śrī Vijaya, that in any case it commemorated a fact of the utmost importance to the State. Dr. Chhabra considers the interpretation of Hüber,

4 F. C. Majumdar, *Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East*, Vol. I, Campā, Bk. III, *Inscriptions of Campā*, p. 134, n. 3.

5 BEFEO., 1930, p. 35, n. 1 and, p. 53, n. 1.

6 This distinction between *siddha* and *siddhi* which Çœdès makes following Monier-Williams' *Dictionary* appears unnecessary, because both the forms are correctly employed in the same sense according to Pāṇini, 3.3.1.14.

7 BEFEO., 1930, p. 58.

8 p. 121.

accepted by Çœdès and Krom, and as we shall see presently, by Stutterheim also, as exceedingly improbable, and prefers Dr. Majumdar's interpretation. But the value of his discussion lies in his having drawn attention to two passages from the *Pañcatantra* and the *Jātaḥamālā* where this expression occurs. Even before the publication of Dr. Chhabra's thesis Çœdès had occasion to discuss the views put forward in it.⁹ He expressed himself as quite willing to believe that the expression *siddha-yātrā* might well mean 'successful in voyage' in most of the contexts under reference including the literary texts cited by Dr. Chhabra, but he felt a difficulty in accepting so weak an interpretation for the phrase in the Keḍukan Bukit inscription where it occurs twice, once in the beginning and again at the end of very significant contexts. He said: "Que dans le textes Sanskrits cités dans l'inscription de Buddhagupta et même dans celle de Nhan-biêu, le mot *siddhayātrā* n'ait que le sens assez banal que lui attribue M. Shastri, je le crois volontiers. Mais dans l'inscription de Palembang, le sens doit être beaucoup plus fort. On notera en effet que le mot *siddhayātra*, y apparaît deux fois, au début et à la fin. Si ne s'agit pas de magie, ... et je ne tiens pas beaucoup à cette interprétation qui n'est pas très satisfaisante..., il doit s'agir de la réussite d'une entreprise, peut-être aventureuse, en tout cas assez importante pour mériter d'être exactement datée et commémorée par une inscription sur pierre."

Lastly Stutterheim in discussing the inscribed stones discovered by Schnitger writes a very interesting note on the expression *siddhayātrā*:¹⁰

"On the significance of this expression opinion is divided. In my opinion these different points of view can be reconciled by the translation 'pilgrimage of victory', that is to say,

⁹ BEFEO., t. XXXIII, pp. 1003-4.

¹⁰ *Qudhiedkundige vondsten in Palembang* door F. M. Schnitger, *Bijlage A*, Verslag over de gevonden inscriptie's door W. F. Stutterheim,

a pilgrimag on which one sets out to obtain the magic power necessary for a victory, though it is possible that in using this expression men did not realise any more the magic character of the word *siddha* (read *siddhi*). The expression *siddhayātrā* or *siddhiyātrā* designates according to lexicons a pilgrimage undertaken for obtaining something which is produced by supernatural means. I do not think, as Çœdès does, that such a thing should necessarily be magical power, for there is some difference between seeking *barakat* (as I would compare this with Javanese usages) and the acquisition of magical power as it is practised at Bali by means of tantric treatises. The prefixing of the word *Jaya*, 'victory', makes it probable that it is a case of princes proceeding to a particular holy place in search of a blessing needed for a victory (or 'success', for *Jaya* need not always stand for victory in war). The expression '*Śrī-Vijaya-jayasiddhayātrā*' of the inscription of Keḍukan Bukit may then signify that the prince in question had completed in the place where the charter is found (Palembang), a pilgrimage needed for victory over Śrī-Vijaya. If this interpretation is correct, it becomes self-evident that there can be no question of foundation of the kingdom of Śrīvijaya as some have thought. Çœdès has already raised a well-founded doubt on this point."

Commenting on this note of Stutterheim, Çœdès has observed ¹¹ that this explanation of *siddhayātrā* as a pilgrimage to a holy place in search of *barakat* is new, and it is possible that it brings us very near to the solution of the problem posed by the enigmatic text of the Keḍukan Bukit inscription. Çœdès also observes very properly that it is necessary to prove otherwise than by simple affirmation that the object of the pilgrimage was to obtain a victory over Śrīvijaya. 'May not *Śrīvijaya-jaya*', he asks, 'signify also a victory of Śrīvijaya?' and adds, rightly, that this question is important. On this last question raised by

11 BEFEO., 1935, p. 380.

Çœdès, one may at once say that until Dr. Stutterheim proves the new identification of Śrīvijaya that he has tentatively put forward, we shall be inclined to answer Çœdès' question in the affirmative, and treat the Keḍukan Bukit inscription as a record commemorating the beginning of an expansionist policy in the history of the kingdom of Śrīvijaya.

Except for a passing doubt in the mind of Çœdès after he read the thesis of Dr. Chhabra, there has been remarkable unanimity among the epigraphists working at first hand on the inscriptions of Indonesia that *siddhayātrā* is a reference to something mystical or magical in character. Çœdès himself has once more gone back to his original position after reading Stutterheim's note on the inscribed stones of Telaga Batu.

We may now proceed to consider if the literary texts mentioned by Dr. Chhabra render this meaning either far-fetched or difficult of acceptance. The texts are from the *Pañcatantra* and the *Jātakamālā* of Āryaśūra, both works most probably anterior to the earliest of the inscriptions from Indonesia mentioning *siddhayātrā*¹². In the *Pañcatantra* the expression occurs in the second tale of Book V. This is a tale of four treasure-seekers, a fact which seems to have led Dr. Chhabra to interpret the sentence *vayam siddhayātrikāḥ* in a rather summary fashion into "We are fortune-hunters"¹³. But as he himself recognises 'a *yogin* does play a rôle in the story and there is mention of a sort of occultism too'. He does not explain how he gets the meaning 'fortune-hunters' out of the phrase *siddhayātrikāḥ*. His own statements on this phrase at p. 19 do not seem to warrant this interpretation. He is right

12 See Keith, *History of Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 68 and 248 for the probable dates of Āryaśūra and the *Pañcatantra*.

13 *op. cit.*, p. 20. It is perhaps worth while noting that the sentence occurs at page 264 of Hertel's edition of the *Pañcatantra*, not 204 as Dr. Chhabra's note 3 on p. 19 has it.

when he says that there is "hardly any ground for changing the term *siddhayātrikāḥ* into *siddhiyātrikāḥ* as the lexicographers have evidently done", but that is because there is really no difference between *siddha* and *siddhi* in the context. The rôle of the *yogī* and occultism in the story of the four treasure-seekers will be seen to be very much greater, in fact to be of the essence of the story, when one reads it in the original. Four poor Brahmins, very friendly to one another, got disgusted with their poverty, held a discussion as to the best means of quickly becoming rich, and having rejected a number of secular means of obtaining wealth, finally decide upon seeking their fortune in foreign lands. After reaching the land of Avanti they bathe in the Siprā river, worship Mahākāla, and as they come out of the temple a *yogī* Bhairavānanda meets them. He takes them to his *maṭha* and then asks them where they were going and for what purpose. The original is this :

*Kuto bhavantah/ kva vā yāsyatha
 kiṃ prayojanaṃ/ tatas-tair-abhihitam-
 vāyam siddhayātrikāḥ/ tatra yāsyāmaḥ
 yatra dhanatṛptir mṛtyur vā bhaviṣyati.*

The facts that they describe themselves as *siddhayātrikāḥ* after they meet the *yogī*, and that they meet the *yogī* only after worshipping Mahākāla, must be firmly grasped. Then they ask the *yogī* for means of getting wealthy and they do so in the following terms :

*tat kathyatām asmākaṃ kaścit dravyopāyaḥ/
 vivarapraveśaḥ/ śākinisādhanaṃ/ śmaśānasevā/
 mahāmāṃsa-vikṛaya-prabhṛtir-vā/ tvaṃ ca adbhuta-
 siddhiḥ śrūyase/ vāyam ca atisāhasikāḥ/*

i. e.,

"Tell us some means of getting money, entering a cave, gaining the grace of Śākinī, practice at crematoria, sale of human flesh, and what not. You are reputed to be a person of wonderful *siddhi*, and we are dare-devils."

Now, one wonders if this is not seeking magical power for attaining one's ends, what is it? And the rest of the story

is that the *yogī* gives to each of the *śiṣyas*, as they are called hereafter, a *siddhavarti*, which they are to carry and walk along in a northerly direction in the lands beyond the Himālayas. The fall of the *siddhavarti* on the earth will be an indication to each of the place containing the treasure he seeks.

In the *Jātaḥamālā* the reference is to the Supāraga Jātaka. Here again a study of the original narrative makes it clear that it is not success in any secular sense that is commemorated in the name Supāraga, but success due to possession of mystic power. It should be noted that it is a Bodhisattva who is the *nausārathi* whose navigation was so successful that he was named Supāraga. The text is :

tasya parama siddha yātratvāt-

supāraga ityeva nāma babhūva:

but as if to make it clear that this power was not a power of the body or mere technical skill, but that it was something occult and mystic in character, we read a few sentences later that even in his old age the sea-traders longing for a prosperous voyage applied to him who was well-known to be an auspicious person; and the conversation between the aged Supāraga and the sea-traders leaves no room for doubt that the aid they sought from Supāraga was mystical in character :

“So it once happened that merchants who trafficked with Goldland, coming from Bharukaccha, longing for a prosperous voyage, touched at the town of Supāraga and requested that Great Being to embark with them. He answered them :

“What kind of assistance do you think to find in me ? Old age, having got power over me, makes my eyesight diminish : in consequence of the many toils I have endured, my attentiveness has grown weak, and even in my bodily occupations I feel my strength almost gone.’

“The merchants said : ‘We are well acquainted with the bodily state of Your Hononr. But this being so, and taking into account your inability for labour, we will not cause

hardship to you nor give any task unto your charge, but we want you for some other reason.

'The dust touched and hallowed by your lotus-like feet will be auspicious to our ship and procure her a happy course over wonder sea, even if assailed by great danger. With this in mind we have applied to you.'¹⁴

It seems clear therefore that *siddhayātrā* in the Indonesian inscriptions is a technical phrase with unmistakable reference to the acquisition of magic power of some sort or other. Even in the Mahānāvika inscription there should be no difficulty in applying the same sense considering that the Supārāga Jātaka furnishes a conspicuous instance in literature of merchants seeking magic means to ensure success for their enterprises.

It may not be without interest to note, finally, that in Indian Purāṇic literature, a number of *kṣetras* (sacred spots) are mentioned as *siddha-* or *siddhi-kṣetras*, where human endeavour is easily crowned with success. Thus we read in the Mahābhārata¹⁵

Yatra gaṅgā mahārāja sa deśastat-tapovanam|

siddhikṣetram ca taj-jñeyam gaṅgā-tirasamanvitam||

and this verse appears in the Matsya Purāṇa (I. 10. 12) with the variations: *mahābhāga* for *mahārāja*, *tapodhanam* for *tapovanam*—clearly a mistake, and *siddhakṣetram* for *siddhi-kṣetram*. Again a *siddhakṣetram* is mentioned in the Vāyu Purāṇa (ch. 23) as located on the top of the Himālaya:

Himavacchikhare caiva mahātūṅge mahālaye

Siddhakṣetram mahāpuṇyam bhaviṣyati mahālayam (v. 175)

siddhakṣetre mahāpuṇye devadānavapūjite

himavac-chikhare puṇye (v. 182).

¹⁴ Aryaśūra, *The Jātakamālā* or *Garland of Birth-stories*, tr. from Sanskrit by J. S. Speyer, pp. 125-26.

¹⁵ III. 83. 97 Kumbakonam edition. Also a *siddhikṣetra* on the Sarasvatī in IX. 40. 16. See Sørensen s.v.,—*Siddh(a)ikṣetram*.

Lastly, in the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa* we read of a *siddhi-kṣetra* in *Amarakaṇṭaka*, where, it is said,

*alpena tapasā siddhiṃ gamiṣyanti na saṃśayaḥ*¹⁶

It is possible that a pilgrimage to some *kṣetra* like this to ensure success in any undertaking came to be called *siddhiyātrā* or *siddhayātrā*.

Madras University

On the Identification of a few Indonesian Sculptures

By Jitendra Nath Banerjea

Λ.

Dr. F. M. Schnitger has drawn the attention of scholars to a very beautiful image found in Papar, Kediri (East Java) in the present issue of this *Journal* (Above, Pls. XIV and XV). It is a four-armed female figure; its upper right and left hands carry a *liṅga* on a lotus and fly-fan, while its lower right and lower left hands hold a rosary and a water-vessel respectively. The figure stands on a double-petalled lotus (*viśvapadma*) and just behind her legs is shown a huge amphibian reptile with uplifted tail. On one side of the back-slab (*prabhāvali*) of the image are carved a few lotus stalks and leaves. On the basis of Dr. Stutterheim's identification of two reliefs—one in the British Museum and the other in the Musée Guimet, Paris, the photographs of which are also reproduced (Above, Pls. XII and XIII) along with that of the Papar image,—Dr. Schnitger identifies the last figure as that of Gaṅgā. After comparing these three images, he opines that all three originated in East Java and were made probably during the 14th century A. D. He further remarks that 'apparently these three are death images, considered an appropriate resting-place for the redeemed souls on account of their relation to the Ganges, the mighty river of the dead.'

But are we quite sure about this identification of any one of these three reliefs? In the case of the Papar image, the most significant features which would disclose its identity are the animal mount and such principal attributes held in its hands, as the phallic emblem on the lotus, the rosary and the vase. These would not justify us in identifying her as

Gaṅgā; the Indian images of Gaṅgā from the Gupta period onwards are almost invariably two-handed and they figure as *dvāradēvatās*. The chief attribute held in their hands is mainly a water-pot and these figures are characterised by their *maṭara*-vehicle. We get, no doubt, descriptions of four-handed Gaṅgā-images in very late texts such as the *Puraścaryārṇava* and the *Prāṇatoṣiṇī Tantra* noticed by late Mr. A. K. Maitreya in his paper on Gaṅgā¹. But, as the following couplets culled from the above texts will show, the attributes mentioned there are not the same as are to be found in the Papar relief. One couplet runs as follows:

Caturbhujāṃ trinetraṃ ca sarvābharaṇabhūṣitāṃ |
Ratnakumbhaśītāmbhojavaraḍābhayaśatkarāṃ ||

The other *dhyāna* mantra which has more meagre iconographic details runs thus:

Surūpāṃ cārunetrāṃ ca candrāyutasāmaprabhāṃ |
Cāmarairvijyamānāntu śvetachutropasobhitāṃ ||
Suprasannāṃ suvaḍanāṃ karuṇārdranijāntarāṃ |
Saḥlāplāvitabhūṣṭhāmārdragandhānulepanāṃ |
Trailokyānamitāṃ Gaṅgāṃ devādibhirabhīstutāṃ ||

The first of the two above extracts lays down that two of the four hands of the figure of Gaṅgā should show *abhaya* and *varaḍa* poses, while the two remaining hands should hold *ratnakumbha* (jewel-pot) and *śītāmbhoja* (white lotus). The *Viśvaṭarmāvatāra Śāstra* describes the image of Gaṅgā as one of the deities, attendants of Varuṇa, the other one being Yamunā. However, these texts do not help us in the correct identification of the Papar relief. One or two details may tally, but these are not its most outstanding features. It must be observed here that we have no means of identifying these Indonesian reliefs except with the help of their Indian proto-types and closely parallel Indian iconographic texts. The beautiful Gaṅgā image in the collection of the Varendra Research Society's Museum at Rajshahi is two-handed and as her hands are broken there is no

way of determining the objects held in them. Dr. Schnitger has referred to a Nālandā bronze figure of the goddess which has been described by Hirananda Sastri as follows: "Some unknown goddess (5¾", high), standing four-armed with halo broken at right side; the left upper hand seems to hold a bough or a branch of a tree, objects in other hands not clear; one indistinct animal sits at each side under an ornamental branch (?); in front of pedestal, two *maḥaras* or fishes are shown rising up towards the deity; a devotee sits to the right side in adoration"². This bronze figure may or may not represent the river-goddess, but its attributes which are indistinct do not help us much in identifying the relief in question. Another two-handed bronze figure of a goddess described by Hirananda Sastri in the same publication³ requires mention here: 'An unidentified figure may represent Gaṅgā standing on a *maḥara*, though the symbols are not at all distinct'. Sastri remarks at the same time, 'If the vehicle can stand for a conventional elephant, she may represent Indrāṇī, though that will be too bold a conjecture'. So we see, neither iconographic texts nor extant reliefs from India help us in identifying the Papar image as that of Gaṅgā.

An attempt may now be made for the proper identification of the relief. Certain iconographic texts, though compiled at a comparatively late period, as well as certain extant reliefs of a fairly early date would help us in throwing some light on its correct identity. While describing six different varieties of Gaurī images, Maṇḍana, the 15th century compiler of the text called *Rūpamaṇḍana*, describes the images of Pārvatī, Śrī and Totalā in this manner:

Akṣasūtram Śivaṃ devaṃ Gaṇādhyakṣaṃ kamaṇḍalum |
Pakṣadvaye'gnikuṇḍe ca mūrtissā Pārvatī smṛtā ||
Akṣasūtram tathā Padmamabhayaṃ ca varaṃ tathā |
Godhāsanāśritā mūrtirgṛhe pūjyā Śrīye(ā) sadā ||

2 *Progress Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, Central Circle*, 1921, p. 47.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 39 & Plate V, No. 2099.

Śulākṣasūtradāṇḍāṃśca vibhrāṇā śvetacāmaram |
Totalā kṛthitā ceyam sarvapāpaprāṇāśiṇi || ⁴

These verses also occur in a slightly altered manner in the eighth chapter of *Devatāmūrtiprakaraṇam*; verses 4 and 7 by the same compiler Maṇḍana enumerate twelve different varieties of the images of Gaurī, viz. Umā, Pārvatī, Gaurī, Lalitā, Śrī, Kṛṣṇā, Haimavatī, Rambhā, Sāvitrī, Trikhaṇḍā(?), Totalā and Tripurā. In the *Rūpamaṇḍana*, however, six varieties of Gaurī, viz., Umā, Pārvatī, Śrī, Rambhā, Totalā and Tripurā are mentioned. Curiously enough, Dr. Schnitger calls attention to Dr. N. K. Bhattasali's enumeration of the varieties of Gaurī images and the plates in illustration thereof in a footnote of his article, and still is of opinion that these images represent Gaṅgā. Dr. Bhattasali has rightly described these as varieties of Gaurī images, though he has failed to notice that the *Rūpamaṇḍana* text speaks of six and not three varieties of Gaurī images under the heading *Gaurī mūrtayaḥ* and that Śrī is the name of one of these varieties. The same text, while referring to the mounts of Gaurī and others, contains :

Godhāsanā bhaved Gaurī līlayā haṃsavāhanā ⁵ |
Siṃhārūḍhā bhaved Durgā mātaraḥ svasvavāhanāḥ ||

From the above-mentioned iconographic extracts we find that the images of Gaurī, the consort of Śiva, should have an alligator (*godhū*) as her vehicle ; while the three particular varieties of Gaurī, viz., Pārvatī, Śrī and Totalā should hold in their four respective hands beginning from lower right, rosary, Śiva (*i. e.* the phallic emblem of Śiva), Gaṇapati, and vase (Pārvatī) ; rosary, lotus, *abhaya* and *vara* (Śrī, who is also described as having an alligator for her mount) ; trident, rosary, staff and a white *chaurie* (Totalā). If we try to understand the Papar relief with

4 *Rūpamaṇḍana*, quoted by T. A. Gopinatha Rao in his *Elements of Hindu Iconography*, Vol. I, Part II, App. C., p. 120.

5 Should it be Totalā, for from the *Viśvaḥarmāvatāra* text we learn that the goddess Totalā had a swan for her vehicle?

the help of these texts, we find that it combines a few of the iconographic features of all the three varieties in itself: thus it has an alligator for her vehicle which is the special mount of Gaurī as well as of her Śrī variety; it holds a rosary as well as the phallic emblem on lotus which are the characteristic attributes of Pārvati, and the fly-whisk in her left hand shows her connection with the Totalā variety of Gaurī.

That the comparatively late texts mentioned above were based on actual images and texts of a far earlier period can be proved by a reference to a few comparatively early Indian reliefs. In the Lankeśvara of the Kailāsa grotto-temple (Elura), a relief-carving shows a goddess standing between two fires, holding in her upper right hand a lotus flower on which is placed the phallic emblem of Śiva, and in her upper left hand another lotus flower with a small figure of Gaṇeśa on it; the objects in the two lower hands are indistinct, but the right hand seems to have held a rosary, while the left hand, a vase; an alligator is shown on the base of the relief⁶. This Elura goddess can very well be indentified as the Pārvati variety of Gaurī images mentioned in the texts quoted above. Its similarity with the Papar relief in some important iconographic details should be noticed. Dr. Bhattasali mentions two images of Pārvati, 'both lying in the mofussil', one of which can be described thus: a crude black stone image of Pārvati has in her four hands, clockwise, a boon, a rosary with the *liṅga*, a trident, 'broken'; Gaṇeśa and Kārttikeya are respectively to her right and left; the mount of the goddess carved below her lotus seat is a small alligator which according to the author looks more like a squirrel. The other black stone image worshipped in a temple called Śiv-vaḍi at the village of Dasora near Mānikgañj, District Dacca, has in her hands,

6 T. A. Gopinatha Rao, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, Part II, Plate CVIII, fig. 1; in this indifferent reproduction the alligator on the base is not distinct. Cf. also, Alice Getty, *Gaṇeśa*, p. 29.

clockwise, boon, rosary and *liṅga*, trident and a vase⁷. The Devī-image from Āriāl, P. S. Taṅgivāḍī, District Dacca, reproduced by Bhattasali⁸ deserves notice here : the four-armed goddess has her lower right hand in the *varada* pose (with a rosary?), upper right hand holding a lotus flower, with a *liṅga* carved a little above it, upper left holds a trident and the lower left a water-vessel. Bhattasali who classifies it as Gaurī remarks thus : 'The image is well-proportioned and has a pleasant face, which reminds one of Javanese sculptures'. Sculptures more or less similar to the ones mentioned above can be found in the collection of the Varendra Research Society's Museum, Rajshahi and the Indian Museum, Calcutta.

The depiction of an alligator as the mount of a variety of Gaurī was continued in Southern India till a comparatively late period. T. A. G. Rao refers to an interesting composite relief of Umā-Maheśvaramūrti at Haveri, Dharwar District, Bombay Presidency, in which the left leg of the goddess rests on the back of an alligator.⁹

A very interesting bronze image of a goddess discovered at Nālandā has a definite bearing on the subject under discussion. It will be necessary for us to quote at length its description by Hirenanda Sastri:¹⁰ 'Bronze 44—Some goddess (7½" h.) standing, four-armed ; r. lower hand gone ; r. upper hand holds rosary, left upper holds a bough or branch of a tree above which a circular disc-like thing is put. The halo shows the sun as well as the moon on it. The lower left hand holds a vase. The umbrella is gone. The pedestal on which the goddess stands is detached at the ankles of the deity. It has four lotus buds at each corner and a crocodile (alligator) at the right foot of the

7 Bhattasali, *Iconography of the Buddhist and Brahmanical Sculptures in the Dacca Museum*, p. 202.

8 *Ibid.*, Plate LXVIII, b.

9 T. A. G. Rao, Vol. II, Part I, Pl. XXXVI, fig. 1.

10 *Progress Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, Central Circle*, 1921, p. 39.

goddess. To the proper right in front of the pedestal a figurine of lion is shown on a projecting piece with left claw raised. To the left a seated buffalo-like animal is similarly shown.....". We fail, no doubt to see a *liṅga* in the back right hand of the bronze figure, but the rosary and the vase in the upper right and lower left hands respectively, the crocodile or the alligator at the right foot of the goddess as well as the lotus buds at each corner definitely prove that it belongs to the class of divinities with which the Papar relief is to be connected. The lion and buffalo-like animals on the respective corners of the pedestal clearly indicate that it is closely associated with Durgā.

We may now refer to the two reliefs, one in the collection of the British Museum and the other in that of the Musée Guimet, which have been utilised by Dr. Schnitger in arriving at his identification of the Papar relief. A brief description of these two images will not be out of place here. The British Museum figure (Above, Pl. XII) is that of a four-handed emaciated goddess standing on a lotus which is placed on the back of an alligator with uplifted tail; the objects held by her hands are extremely indistinct (her right hands seem to grasp a water-vessel and a skull); a scorpion appears to be carved on her shrunken belly; a tree (plantain?) seems to be depicted on her proper left. But the most remarkable feature as regards this image is the presence of a *dhyanī*-Buddha-like figure just above her; she seems to carry this divine figure on her head. The Musée Guimet relief (Above Pl. XIII) is a much corroded figure of a two-handed emaciated goddess standing on a lotus-flower placed on the back of an alligator with uplifted tail; her left hand holds a bough of a tree (or a lotus stalk?) and her right hand a three-pronged object (a *sūla*?); she wears a *jaṭāmukūṭa*. Barring the *dhyanī*-Buddha-like figure on the top of the former relief, this detailed description of the two leaves no doubt about their identity. They are undoubtedly varieties of Durgā-Pārvatī images, and if we are correct in describing them as representing an emaciated deity (Schnitger also notes it in

his brief description of these two), we shall be justified in going a step further and describing them as varieties of Caṇḍi images. The *dhyānī* figure in the case of the first relief can be explained by referring to Brahmanical reliefs belonging to the Eastern School of Sculpture in India which bear on or above their heads similar figures.¹¹

N.B.—The learned editor of this *Journal* drew my attention to these interesting Indonesian reliefs and invited my opinion about them. I am indebted to him for his kindly allowing me to examine the photographs, as well as read Dr. Schnitger's paper, before it was in print.

B.

Dr. F. M. Schnitger excavated at Poelo, on the northern bank of the Panei river, Tapanoei (Sumatra) a small temple dating from the 11th or 12th century A. D. He discovered five stone reliefs, representing a series of dancing figures, some with human and others with animal faces which originally decorated the towers of the structure. In his brief account of these figures¹² he remarks: 'Probably this Buddhist temple was the grave of some royal personage and the reliefs portray his servants or members of his family.' He observes further, 'Although Buddhistic in character, they are taken from Śivaite theology in which the world originated in a heavenly dance.'

The sculptures have to be studied more from the point of view of their Śivaite proto-types than from that of their present Buddhist connection, for this will help us in understanding their real nature. They may or may not portray 'the servants or members of the family of some royal personage,' but they appear to be derived from the *Śivagaṇas*, the impish attendants of Śiva, who are so

11 Cf. Lakṣaṇakāṭī image of Viṣṇu, Bhattasali, *op. cit.*, Pl. XXXII. *Varendra Research Society, Appendices to Annual Report for 1928-29*, p. 16 and the accompanying plate

12 *JGIS.*, Vol. IV, No. 1, January 1937, pp. 43-4, and Plates VII and VIII.

frequently represented in the Śaiva shrines of northern and southern India. Some varieties of the images of Śiva are attended by various *gaṇas* and *bhūtas* of different forms shown in multifarious poses, singing and dancing.¹³ If we refer to a few Indian reliefs, both early and late, we shall be able to light upon the undoubted proto-types of these Sumatran sculptures. The remains of the dado of the Śiva temple (c. 6th cent, A. D.) excavated by the late Mr. R. D. Banerji at Bhumara in the State of Nagod, in Central India, contain numerous figures of these *Śivagaṇas*, many among them with animal faces; they are shown in various poses, some of them playing on musical instruments and some others dancing in a vigorous manner.¹⁴ The relief carvings in the Śivaite shrines of Badami and Elura in Western India contain among other subjects the representations of these curious attendants of Śiva. The Ardhanārīśvara panel in the Cave temple (No. 1) at Badami bears on its lowermost section 'small figures of the same *gaṇas*, some dancing and others playing upon different musical instruments'; the dancing pose of the fourth figure from the extreme left in this panel very closely resembles that of the figure no. 3 of the Poelo sculptures.¹⁵ The large stone panel belonging to the Rāmeśvara Cave temple at Elura which depicts in a remarkable manner the scene of marriage between Śiva and Pārvati, has in its lower part 'a row of most humorous *gaṇas*, some with animal faces, others with animal-mouthed bellies' shown in various postures, dancing, singing and engaged in various other activities.¹⁶

13 *Nānāgaṇasamāyuktaṃ nānābhūtasamākūlaṃ/ ... Nānārūpadharair-bhūtairaneṣaiḥ parivāritaṃ/ Bherikākāhaḍādyādhyairgānanāṣṭāraṇāvākūlaiḥ//* T. A. Gopinatha Rao, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, Pt. II, App. B., p. 151;—extract from *Uttarakāmiḱāgma*, (a South Indian Śivaite text), 52nd *Paṭala*.

14 R. D. Banerji, *The Temple of Śiva at Bhumara, Mem. Arch. Surv. of India*, No. 16, pp. 8-11, Pls. IX-XI.

15 R. D. Banerji, *The Bas-reliefs of Badami, Mem. Arch. Surv. India* No. 25, Pl. III, fig (a).

16 T. A. G. Rao, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, Pt. I, pp. 350-1, Pl. CV.

It is useless to multiply instances; a search among the numerous Śaiva shrines both in the north and south of India will reveal many such figures which could have served as the prototypes of these Sumatran sculptures. Thus Dr. Schnitger's description of these sculptures requires some modification. Incidentally we may remark that figure no. 3¹⁷ which he describes 'as a man in a dancing pose of extreme abandon, an attitude found in Cambodia but never in Java', is depicted as engaged in a dance which is a curious caricature of the *lalāṭa-tilakā* mode of dance of Śiva¹⁸; similarly, the Poelo bull- (goat ?) faced figure (no. 5) is dancing in a manner more or less suggestive of the *talasaṃsphoṭita* mode of dance of Śiva.¹⁹ Figures 4 and 5 which have been described by Dr. Schnitger respectively as an elephant and a bull are really elephant and bull- (? goat) faced human beings; the former has got its proto-type in Gaṇapati, the chief of the *gaṇa*s of Śiva, and the latter, if it possesses a goat's or even an antelope's head, in Naigameśa, an aspect of Subrahmaṇya-Kārttikeya,²⁰ 'who is represented in mediaeval pictures as a man with the head of an antelope'.²¹

The sculptures are, thus, extremely interesting for more reasons than one. Dr. Schnitger was quite correct when he observed that these were taken from the Śivaite theology and that their Indian proto-types must exist somewhere in South India. As we have seen, these are

17 JGIS., Vol. IV, No. 1, Pl. VIII.

18 Cf. the Tiruccheṅgāṭṭaṅguḍi and Conjeevaram *ṇṭṭamūrtis* of Śiva, T. A. G. Rao, *op. cit.*, vol. II, pp. 1, Pl. LXVIII,

19 T. A. G. Rao, *Ibid.*, Pl. LXVIII.

20 Cf. Hopkins, *Epic Mythology*, p. 230: 'Chāgamuṇḍa is some "goat" form spirit identified with Skanda, who may himself be a leaping goat in his first form'.

21 G. Bühler on Mathura Sculptures in *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. II, p. 314. for a comparatively early goat-headed inscribed figure of Nemeso-Naigameśa in its Jain setting, see *ibid.*, Pl. II a; the inscription reads *Bhagavā Nemeso*.

undoubtedly to be found not only in the south of India from which these art-motifs migrated in early and mediaeval times in course of its long contact with Suvarṇadvīpa, but also in the north of India with which no possible early Malayasian contact can be determined at present.

Calcutta University.

MISCELLANY

Hindus in Afghanistan, Persia and Russia in 1783

By D. B. Diskalkar

George Forster's *Travels* gives an account of his journey from Bengal to England in 1782-84. Forster left Calcutta on the 23rd of May 1782 and arrived at Benares on the 26th August where he stayed till the 11th December engaged in 'an investigation into the mythology of the Hindoos'. As he had 'a conversant knowledge of the Marhatta language and an acquaintance, though very trivial, with the Sanskrit,' which he says 'is a sonorous language abounding in pith and conciseness', he could do this in a short time as is seen from his sketches of Hindu mythology, published in his letters written from Benares. Leaving Benares on the 12th December 1782 and passing by an overland route through various places in Northern India, Kashmir, Afghanistan and Persia and into Russia by the Caspian Sea he reached St. Petersburg on the 25th May 1784 and England in July 1784. His notes on his day-to-day travels which are recorded in the book are full of information and show that Forster was a man of extraordinary courage, wonderful energy and keen observation. As he was already well acquainted with the Hindus and their religious and social customs he was particular to note everything about them that attracted his attention during his travels in the non-Hindu countries. Although most of the Hindus he met with were trading people specially from Multan, and consequently were more or less floating bodies, there were some who had permanently settled in some places, courageously withstanding all the disabilities they were frequently subjected to by the bigoted rulers of the countries. The account therefore of the fire-altar

maintained by them at Baku and of the *Sannyāsi* making the tour of the world will be read with special interest. Below we give all those passages in the book which refer to Hindus in foreign countries and which it is hoped will be found interesting by students of Greater India history.

P. 90—'The cities and towns (in Afghanistan) are chiefly inhabited by Hindoos and Mahometans of the Punjab, who were established by the former princes of Hindostan to introduce commerce and civilisation into their western provinces.'

P. 115—'At Kandahar are established many Hindoo families, chiefly of Moultan and Rajepoot districts, who by their industry and mercantile knowledge, have essentially augmented its trade and wealth.....The extensive range of shops occupied by Hindoo traders, with the ease and contentment expressed in their deportment, affords a fair testimony of their enjoying at Kandahar liberty and protection.'

P. 125—'On the 23rd (October 1783) at Ghurmow, in the desert, five fursungs. This evening my persecuting companion left our party, and proceeded with some Hindoo traders to Fera, an Afghan town of some note, lying about forty or fifty miles to the south-west of Drauza'.

P. 151—'At Herat I found, in two *karavanseras*, about one hundred Hindoo merchants, chiefly natives of Moultan, who by the maintenance of a brisk commerce, and extending a long chain of credit, have become valuable subjects to the government; but discouraged by the insolent and often oppressive treatment of the Persians, they are rarely induced to bring their women into this country. When the Hindoos cross the Attock, they usually put on the dress of a northern Asiatic: being seldom seen without a long cloth coat and a high cap.'

P. 186—'About one hundred Hindoo families, from Moultan, and Jessilmere, are established in this town, which is the extreme limit of their emigration on this side of Persia; they occupy a quarter in which no

Mahometan is permitted to reside, and where they conducted business without molestation or insult: and I was not a little surprized to see those of the Bramin sect, distinguished by the appellation of Peerzadah, a title which the Mahometans usually bestow on the descendants of their prophet. Small companies of Hindoos are also settled at Muschid, Yezd, Kachan, Casbin, and some parts of the Caspian shore; and more extensive societies in the different towns of the Persian Gulf, where they maintain a navigable commerce with the western coast of India.'

P. 256—'A society of Moulton Hindoos, which has long been established in Baku, contributes largely to the circulation of its commerce; and with the Armenians, they may be accounted the principal merchants of Shirwan. The Hindoos, of this quarter, usually embark at Tatta, a large insular town in the lower tract of the Indus, whence they proceed to Bassorah, and there accompany the *karavans* which are frequently passing into Persia. Some also travel inland to the Caspian Sea, by the road of Kandahar and Herat; but the number is small, and they grievously complain of the oppressions and insults of the Mahometans.

On the 31st of March, I visited the Atashghah, or place of fire; and on making myself known to the Hindoo mendicants, who resided there, I was received among these sons of Brimha as a brother; an appellation they used on perceiving that I had acquired some knowledge of their mythology, and had visited their most sacred places of worship. This religious retirement, where the devotees worship their deity in the semblance of fire, is a square of about thirty yards, surrounded with a low wall, and contains many apartments; in each of which is a small volcano of sulphurous fire, issuing from the ground through a furnace, or funnel, constructed in the form of an Hindoo altar.'

P. 291—'I must mention to you that we brought

from Baku five Hindoos ; two of them were merchants of Moultan, and three were mendicants; a father, his son, and a Sunyasse. The last was a hale, spirited young man, who, impelled by an equal alertness in mind and body, blended also with a strong tincture of fanaticism, was making, it may be termed, the tour of the world; for he did not seem to hold it a matter of much concern whither his course was directed, provided he was in motion.

The Hindoos at Baku had supplied his little wants, and recommended him to their agents in Russia, whence he said, he would like to proceed with me to England. The Moulтанее Hindoos were going to Astracan on a commercial adventure merely, and would not have gone a mile out of the road to have served God or man. When I accused the Hindoos of polluting themselves by drinking the cask-water, and preparing victuals in the ship-kitchen, they observed, that they had already become impure by crossing the forbidden river, beyond which all discrimination of tribes ceased. Though spirituous liquors are forbidden to the Hindoos, it does not appear that the use of *bang*, an intoxicating weed which resembles the hemp in Europe, and is prepared either for smoking or a draught, is considered even by the most rigid a breach of the law, for they drink it without reserve, and often to excess.

P. 300—'The city of Astracan is supposed to contain about eighty thousand inhabitants. Exclusive of the Russians, there is a numerous colony of Nagayan Tartars (the ancient people of the country), many Greeks, Armenians, and Circassians, some itinerant Persians, and a small society of Hindoos.'

P. 303—'In this city, which occupies a mediate situation between Asia and Europe, there is perhaps a more diversified assemblage of nations, than on any other spot on the globe, and a more liberal display of toleration; you see the Greek, Lutheran, and Roman churches, mingled with the Mahomedan mosque and Hindoo pagoda, and the

different sectaries united by the bonds of a common social compact. The largest portion of the industry and adventure which supports commerce of Astracan is contributed by the Armenians.'

'The Hindoos also enjoy at Astracan very fair indulgence ; nor could they in the most celebrated places of worship in India, perform their rites with more freedom. They are not stationary residents, nor do they keep any of their females in this city; but after accumulating a certain property they return to India, and are succeeded by other adventurers. Being a mercantile sect of their nation, and occupied in a desultory species of traffic, they have neglected to preserve any record of their first settlement, and subsequent progress in this quarter of Russia ; nor is the fact ascertained with any accuracy by the natives of Astracan. In the *karavensara* allotted to them, which is commodious and detached, they make their ablutions and offer up their prayers, without attracting even the curiosity of the Christians ; and they do not fail to gratefully contrast so temperate a conduct with that of Persia, where their religion, persons and prosperity, are equally exposed to the attacks of bigotry and avarice.'

Historical Museum, Satara.

NOTICES OF BOOKS

Flamen-Brahman, par Georges Dumézil ; Annales du Musée Guimet. Bibliothèque de Vulgarisation. Tome cinquante-unième. Paul Geuthner, Paris, 1935.

In this little book of just over a hundred pages Mr. Dumézil has started a very ingenious theory as to the origin of the Brahman-priest of the Vedic ritual, and, it appears, also of the Brāhmaṇa caste in general ; for, at least in the later portions of the work, he has not tried to keep the two distinct—when, for instance, he refers to the *Smṛtis* (p. 61) for support for his theory.

The author's chiefest discovery is that the primitive Indo-Europeans used to honour their kings by killing them on certain occasions to placate the higher powers ; but as the kings gradually got diffident of this singular privilege and wanted to share responsibilities with another person, the Brahman, who became a sort of *alter ego* to him used to take his place at the time of the gruesome human sacrifice. As the king owed his life to the Brahman, he had naturally to honour him highly, and although the Brahman took no active part in the sacrifice, he was hence entitled to half the sacrificial fee. All this follows from the legend of Śunaḥśepa and a few other passages all of which can be and have been explained more easily and naturally.

The Flamen Dialis is the Roman counterpart of the Vedic Brahman. The author quotes with obvious relish the words "*il est une victime vivante, sans cesse parée pour le dieu auquel elle appartient*" (p. 43) and interprets the words in italics in the literal sense, no doubt because otherwise he would not have found any evidence at all in Roman ritual for his daring theory. To explain the relation between the *rex* and the *flamen* it is absurd to suggest that the *flamen* used to be sacrificed instead of the *rex* by the early Indo-European Italians. If the *flamen* was not usu-

ally allowed to depart from the city, how does it follow that it was because he was an unsacrificed victim ? What reason is there to believe that the sanctity of person is attainable only through unconsummated immolation ? Even if the origin of the Brahman and the Flamen may some day be proved to have been similar, we would still be far off from being able to refer them to a *common* origin as Mr. Dumézil has attempted to do. We have always to recognise the possibility of the primitive mind reacting on similar surroundings in the same or similar ways. Perhaps out of this consideration Mr. Dumézil has thought fit to discuss the phonological aspect of the equation *flamen:brahman*. And inspite of his treatment of the problem the equation remains as before an unproved possibility.

On the whole the book must be regarded as a very able pleading for a seemingly hopeless case. Mr. Dumézil writes very persuasively. And it is no wonder that he himself has fallen a prey to his own power of persuasion.

BATAKRISHNA GHOSH

Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of Ceylon, Vol. III. The Excavations in the Citadel of Anurādhapura, 1936. Pp. vi+38, 5 Plans and 25 Plates.

This memoir contains an account of the excavations, conducted during the years 1928, 1929, 1932 and 1933, on several sites within the Citadel (the "Inner City" or *ātnakara*) of the ancient city of Anurādhapura, the capital of the Sinhalese monarchy for a period of over 1000 years. In 1913 some preliminary excavations were undertaken by Mr. Ayrton within this area, but regular work was first started in 1928 and continued through the successive working seasons till 1933 with a temporary suspension, owing to shortage of funds, in the years 1930 and 1931. The results of the first two years' work were briefly communicated by Dr. Joseph Pearson, D.Sc., the then officiating Archaeological Commissioner, in the pages of the *Annual Bibliography of Indian*

Archaeology, for the year 1929 (pp. 11-13 and Pl. VI), and the present memoir is the official report of four years' work, drawn up by Mr. S. Paranavitana, M.A., who also for some time officiated in that post.

Apart from the Introduction which briefly discusses the location of this citadel, the Memoir contains three sections describing the results of the operations conducted on three sites within this area—the site between the Mahāpālī and the Gedige, the Daḷadāge or the Temple of the Tooth and the Mahāpālī or the Alms-house. Remains of several buildings have been laid bare, but they are too fragmentary to allow us to form any idea about their structural or architectural features and, in some cases, even about their ground plan. The excavations again have not as yet furnished us with anything which can go to support the evidence of the inscriptions connecting the area concerned with the "Royal Enclosure."

All the buildings excavated, except one, belong to the uppermost stratum and have been dated by the author in the 10th century A.D., i.e., the end of the *Anurādhapura* period. Not infrequently they indicate the use of older materials collected from earlier structures. Indeed it became evident on deeper digging that "the foundations of the tenth century Mahāpālī were laid on the ruins, and following the lines, of earlier buildings" (p. 27). The tenth century buildings all represent extensive pillared halls, which were in all probability roofed over with glazed tiles of probably indigenous manufacture. Nothing has been known as to the internal arrangement of these halls and it is not possible to say whether these halls were enclosed by walls or were left open. As bricks were found very sparsely in the debris round about these ruins, the author appears to be quite correct in suggesting that the walls, if there were any, were constructed of clay, as in the Kandyan buildings.

Deeper operations, where permissible on account of the disappearance of the upper strata foundations, exposed the remains of earlier structures at lower levels—such as the retaining walls of three different periods below the ruins of

the outer *prākāra* of the Daladāge quadrangle, vestiges of older structures on the northern and eastern sides of the Mahāpālī, etc. Again potsherds inscribed with Brāhmī letters of *circa* 2nd century B.C. and copper coins of probably pre-Christian dates, which have been found sporadically at different levels on the different sites and which were evidently thrown up "in disturbing the deposits of the lower strata when the ground was dug for foundations of buildings in successive ages" indicate that the whole site had been in occupation from pre-Christian times, a fact which is quite in agreement with the evidence of the chronicles. The upper strata remains are too fragmentary and it would be well if the Archaeological Department of Ceylon were to consider the advisability of conducting deeper operations throughout the entire area for earlier edifices and structures. This may prove important, not only from the standpoint of arihaeology but also from the point of view of the early history of the sity as well as of the island.

Mention should specially be made of a building the remains of which have been laid bare on the site between the Mahāpālī and the Gedige (Building A of the plans). Both Dr. Pearson and Mr. Paranavitana describe this edifice as a novel type in Sinhalese architecture, the only like of which to be found in the whole island is the Gedige, which stands a little to the north-east. From an inscription on the *āsana* within the inner room this structure (and hence also the Gedige, which stands on the same level) can be definitely dated in the 8th century A.D. The novelty consists in the ground plan, which is externally a square with the middle portion of each face projected forward, the projection on the northern face being further extended to form a porch. In the interior we have the circumambulatory passage, running round the inner room, which is a perfect square with its entrance to the north. Besides the doorway through the porch the passage is lighted by eleven stone windows and on the western wall there is a stone staircase, built into the thickness of the wall, leading to the upper storey. Both Dr. Pearson and Mr. Paranavitana think that the edifice had a

vaulted roof. But this is a mere surmise based upon the discovery of a single fragment of an arch constructed of wedge-shaped bricks.

As, except the Gedige, no identical structure can be found throughout the entire island, it is but reasonable to assume that this type was not indigenous. Its newness consists in the peculiar arrangement of the ground plan, not to be found in any other building in Ceylon, except the Gedige. Unfortunately the walls are preserved to no very great height and we know next to nothing regarding the method of roofing or superstructure. It is possible that, if preserved, this too might have furnished us with novel features, unknown in the island.

Now, as regards the question of origin of the type one would naturally turn to South India, which is so near and which has influenced the art and architecture of Ceylon in no small degree. But this plan, the setting forward of the middle portion of each face of a square, is, so far as I am aware, unknown in Southern India. The projections and corresponding returns with their flanking pilasters along the outer faces of walls, which we notice in South Indian temples, are quite different and have nothing to do with this setting forward of the central portion of each face, a characteristic quite common in Northern, especially in Eastern India, where we can trace the gradual stages of the evolution of this feature from the simplest beginnings of its most intricate elaborations. The pedestal of the early image (c. 7th-8th centuries A.D.) of the Eastern Indian school usually shows a single projection in the middle portion, and this plan when extended to the other three sides, gives us exactly the same ground plan—a square with the central portion of each face set forward—that can be found also in the earlier temples of Eastern India. The plan of the ruined temple, laid bare at Paharpur in Bengal, offers a close approximation to that of this peculiar edifice in Ceylon, except for the fact that the former is a terraced temple where there are additional projections at each lower terrace. The Simhales edifice again has affinities with the

Paharpur temple in the windows on the outer walls lighting up the passage and the staircase in the thickness of the wall. Of course the moonstone, the balustrades and the guard-stones are typically Simhalese. But the remarkable similarity in the ground plan and internal arrangement of the two edifices—one in the island of Ceylon and the other in far off Eastern India, where such an edifice appears to be the characteristic type—cannot be passed over too lightly. The influence of Eastern India, especially of Bengal, on the architecture of Further India (Burma, Siam, Cambodia, Java, etc.) is now being recognised, and in view of the similarity under notice the question of the expansion and the relative proportion of this influence in Ceylon has now to be investigated.

Among the other interesting results of the excavations may be mentioned the discovery of a unique well close to the ruins of the Mahāpāli, "the like of which", says Mr. Paranavitana, "has not been found in any other ancient site in Ceylon." It measures 33 ft. by 23 ft. at the top and its uniqueness consists in the "flights of steps, passages and platforms, along the eastern, northern and western sides, which enable one to descend with ease and safety right down to the very bottom." So far as its arrangement and dimensions are concerned it is probable that it might represent the *vāpī* or the "pleasure-tank", so frequently mentioned in ancient Sanskrit literature. The use of lime mortar in the eighth century i.e., before the Polonnarua period (p. 7), the preparation of glazed tiles independently in Ceylon (p. 5), and the system of underground drainage with the help of terra-cotta pipes socketed together (p. 8) are also important deductions from the results of these excavations. The thin circular gold-plate with the figure of a lion between two lampstands (p. 9), fragments of gilt earthenware (p. 12), not found elsewhere in Ceylon, the round porcelain box of probably Chinese make ((p. 20-21) and the crystal seal—"a very decadent imitation of Graeco-Roman or Graeco-Persian seals" (pp. 30-31)—are among the interesting minor finds.

The printing of the text and the get-up of the book are quite commendable. Only one typographical error requires to be corrected. Instead of "To the south-west of the building . . ." at the beginning of the last paragraph of page 5 should be read "To the south-east of the building . . .". The excellent plans and reproductions greatly enhance the value of the publication.

SARASI KUMAR SARASWATI

Hindoe-Invloed in Noordelijk Batakland, By J. Tideman, Published by the Batak Institute, Publication No. 23, pp. 59 + a map, Amsterdam, 1936.

This is a monograph on Hindu influence in ancient Batak. Batak is a small tract of country in the main island of Sumatra lying north of the small island of Baros and north-west of Palembang beyond Minangkabau. Sumatran archaeology has been little studied as compared to that of the sister-island of Java: in fact archaeological explorations in Sumatra are just at their beginning. Dr. Schnitger's explorations in Palembang, Padang Lawas, and Batang Hari have already brought to light some remarkable sculptures and other monuments, and Mr. Tideman's monograph provides archaeologists with an additional work on the subject.

Mr. Tideman does not bring to light any new archaeological or literary material; but he presents an admirable study of the existing material, in course of which he examines the old religion of Batak and the history of Hindu cultural expansion in Indonesia. He describes the writing, language, mythology, calendar, games, symbols and musical instruments in use among the Bataks including the part played by Indian culture therein. He also discusses the possible routes followed by Indian colonists to the mainland of Batak and the island of Baros; in course of this discussion he examines the early commercial relations of South India with the island of Baros and the intimate relations that existed between Batak and Baros. Mr. Tideman's conclu-

sions are that (a) Batak contact with India (Pallava-Cola region of South India) was established as early as the beginning of the Christian era, and resumed in the 11th century; it followed the route that passed through the Straits as far as Koetu, as well as a bifurcated route along the lower coast direct to Batakland; (b) Mahāyāna influences penetrated into the island of Sumatra as early as 414 A. D. (Fa-Hien); these influences were certainly active in 672 (I-tsing); and (c) Indo-Javanese culture in Sumatra travelled via Minangkabau to Batakland in the 13th, 14th and 15th centuries.

NIHAR RANJAN RAY

Oudheidkundig Verslag, 1936. Published by the Royal Batavian Institute of Arts and Sciences, pp. 24 + 12 plates, Bandoeng, 1937.

The Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of Netherland-India for 1936 issued by Dr. W. F. Stutterheim, Director of the Survey, summarises, as usual, the work of the Department under the heads of administration, explorations and other tours of officers, conservation of monuments, explorations and researches, new finds of archaeological interest etc., with a programme of work for 1937. The report is concise but none the less precise and informative.

The most important conservation work was carried on in the Tjandi Singasari and in several temples at Prambanam and Penanggoengan, the last site having received until now very little attention from scholars. This site yielded to last year's excavations at least two important sculptures (Ibid figs. 15 and 16) and three terracottas (Ibid figs. 17, 18 and 19). The most important finds are those of a stone image of Gaṇeśa seated on a lotus-seat from Gebang, and a crouching figure of an elephant from Wonoredjo. Important are also the finds of two short inscriptions on stone, one from Djenggring dated 1010 (?) Śaka = 1088 A. D. and

written in two forms of letters, and another form Selaliman (Ibid figs. 23 and 28 respectively). A fascinating Chinese vase, unearthed from Cheribon, forms the subject-matter of figure 26.

NIHAR RANJAN RAY

L'archéologie du Tonkin et les Fouilles de Dong-So'n,
Par Victor Goloubew, Avant-propos de George Coedès,
Hanoi 1937.

This monograph meets a number of adverse criticisms passed by Prof. Emile Gaspardone concerning the archaeological excavations in Tonkin carried out under the auspices of the French School of the Far-East. In particular it seeks to disprove the charge of neglect of Tonkin archaeology by the School and justify its excavation of a prehistoric site along with its methods of studying the same. These points are worth serious consideration *apropos* certain remarks of Prof. Gaspardone in course of his paper published in a previous issue (Vol. IV. No.1) of this Journal.

U. N. G.

Notes

Dr. Kalidas Nag, Joint-Secretary of the Greater India Society, has just returned to Calcutta after completing his six months' term as Visiting Professor of Indian Culture at the University of Hawaii. At the University he delivered courses of lectures on Indian Civilisation and Indian Fine Arts. He had also the privilege of delivering the University Convocation Address. His mission has led to the opening of an Indian section of the Oriental Institute at the University.

* * * *

During the last six months the *Journal of the Greater India Society* has been placed on the exchange-list of two important Oriental Magazines: *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, and *Rivista degli Studi Orientali*. To the authorities in charge of these Magazines the Society offers its best thanks. The Society is particularly grateful to the Malayan Branch of the RAS. for presentation of back numbers of their *Journal* commencing from Vol. XIV.

* * * *

As in previous years the Greater India Society has to record its most grateful acknowledgements to two donors, viz., the authorities of the National Council of Education, Bengal, and Dr. Narendra Nath Law, M. A., Ph. D., one of the most esteemed members of the Managing Committee of the Society.

* * * *

Dr. G. Tucci's work called *Travels of Tibetan Pilgrims in the Swât Valley* which is one of the Society's announcements is expected to be out by the end of the current year. The authorised translation of Dr. N. J. Krom's *Hindoe-Javaansche*

Geschiedenis by Mr. Himansu Bhusan Sarkar, M. A. is in active course of preparation.

* * * *

The Java Institute is going to organise a Cultural Congress at Bali from the 18th to the 23rd October 1937, both days inclusive. The full programme is announced in the current number of its organ the '*Djāwa*.'

* * * *

Dr. H. G. Quaritch Wales, Field Director of the Greater India Research Committee, whose exploration of the ancient city of Śrīdeva in Siam during 1934-35 roused such keen interest, proposes to take up the systematic exploration of early Indian sites in British Malaya by the end of the present year. Adequate funds have been placed at his disposal by the Governments of the Federated Malay States and Kedah.

As we are going through the Press we have the pleasure of announcing the immediate publication of Dr. Quaritch Wales' forthcoming work—*Towards Angkor*, illustrated with 42 plates and 5 maps.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliography—January-July 1937

Central Asia

Bailey, H. W. Ttagara (*Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*), Vol. VIII, pt. 4

Do, Hvatanica (*Ibid*), Vol. VIII, pt. 4 and Vol. IX pt. 1

Burrow, T., Further Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Niya, (*Ibid*) Vol. IX, pt. 1

Ceylon

Hocart, A. M., Archaeological Summary (*Ceylon Journal of Science, Section G.*, Vol. II, pt. 2)

Paranavitana, S., Epigraphical Summary (*Ibid.*)

Codrington, H. W., Gāvuta Pillars (*ibid.*)

Do., Two Dāgabas of Parākrama Bāhu I (*Ibid.*)

Do., The Polonnaruva Council Chamber Inscriptions (*Ibid.*)

Paranavitana, S. The capital of Ceylon during the ninth and tenth centuries

Champa and Cambodia

Sastri, K. A. Nilakanta, L'origine de l' alphabet 'du Campā, *BEFEO.*, (t. XXXV, Fasc. 2)

Parmentier, H., La construction dans l' architecture khmère classique (*Ibid.*)

Çœdès, G., Etudes cambodgiennes: XXXI A propos du Tchen-la d'eau: trois inscriptions de Cochinchine. XXXII La plus ancienne inscription en Pāli du Cambodge (*BEFEO.*, t. XXXVI, Fasc. 1)

China

Thomas, F. W., A Buddhist Chinese text in Brāhmī script (*ZDMG.*, Bd. 91, heft. 1)

Exhaustive study of Chinese text of *Vajra-cchedikā* in Brāhmī script of 8th-9th century

Indonesia

- Juynboll, H. H., Vertaling van Sarga XXIV, XXV en XXVI (slot) van het Oud-Javaansche Rāmāyaṇa (*Bijdragen tot de Taal-Land en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, Deel 94, Afl. 3)
- Moens, J. L., Śrīvijaya, Yāva en Kaṭāha (*Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, Deel LXXVII, 1937 Afl. 3)
- Nilakanta Sastri, K. A. Śrīvijaya, Candrabhānu and Vira-Pāṇḍya (*Ibid.*, Deel LXXVII, Afl. 2)

Malay Peninsula

- Braddell, Roland, An introduction to the study of ancient times in Malay Peninsula (*J. Malay Branch RAS.*, Vol. XIV, Pts. II and III)
- Çœdès, G., Apropos d' une nouvelle théorie sur le site de Śrīvijaya (*Ibid.*, Vol. XIV, Pt. III)
 Contests the theory of H. G. Quaritch Wales about the route of spread of Indian culture as well as of identification of C'aiya with Śrīvijaya.
- Linehan, W., A History of Pahang (*J. Malay Branch RAS.*, Vol. XIV, Pt. II)

BOOKS RECEIVED

The Greater India Society acknowledges with thanks the receipt of the following books, periodicals, pamphlets etc. during the last six months.

Periodicals

Adyar Library Bulletin (Brahma-Vidyā), Vol. I, Part 2, Madras 1937.

Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Vol. XVIII, Part I, Poona 1936 ; Part III, Poona 1937.

Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië, Deel 95, 's-Gravenhage, 1937

Buddha-Prabhā, Vol. V, No. 1, Bombay 1937

Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient, Tome XXXVI, Fasc. 1, Hanoi, 1937

Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, Vol. IX, Pt. 1, London, 1937

Djāwā, 17 Jaarg., Nos. 1 & 2 ; 3 & 4, Batavia, 1937

Inner Culture, Vol. IX, No. 4, Los Angeles, 1937

Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. XII, No. 4 Vol. XIII, Nos. 1 and 2, Calcutta, 1937

Journal of the Annamalai University, Vol. VI, No. 3, Annamalainagar 1937

Journal of Indian History, Vol. XV, Pt. 3 ; Vol. XVI, Pt. 1 ; Madras, 1937

Journal of the Malayan Branch, Royal Asiatic Society, Vols. XII, XIII ; XIV ; XV (Pt. 1.), Singapore, 1934-37

Karṇāṭaka Historical Review, Vol. IV Nos. 1 and 2, Dharwar, 1937

Literatur-Overzicht (Kon. Inst. Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië), Deel 1, 's-Gravenhage, 1937

Mīmāṃsā Prakāśa, Vol. I No. 5, Poona, 1937

Ostasiatische Zeitschrift, 12 Jahrg., 5-6 heft, Berlin, 1936 ; 13 Jahrg., 1 heft, Berlin, 1937

Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society, Vol. XXVII, Nos. 3 and 4 ; Vol. XXVIII, No. 1, Bangalore City, 1937

- Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*,
Deel LXXVII, afl. 2 and 3, Batavia, 1937
Tropisch Nederland, 9 Jaarg., No. 25, Vienna, 1937

Books, Pamphlets etc.

- Annamalai University Calendar*, 1936-39
Butler, Nicholas Murray, *The American as he Is*, New York, 1937
Braddell, Roland, *An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Times in the Malay Peninsula and the Straits of Malacca* (Part II), Singapore, 1937
Do, *Further Notes upon a Study of Ancient Times in the Malay Peninsula*, Singapore 1937
Carpani, Enrico G., *Nirvāṇa*, Bologna, 1934
Do, *Samādhi*, Fasc. II and III 1935-1936
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Annual Report for 1936
Çœdès, G., *A propos d' une nouvelle théorie sur le site de Śrīvijaya*, Singapore, 1937
Garde, M. B., *A Hand-book of Gwalior*, Gwalior, 1937
Goloubew, Victor, *L' Archéologie du Tonkin et les Fouilles de Dông-S' on*
Kon. Koloniaal Inst. te Amsterdam, *Anwinsten op ethnografisch en anthropologisch gebied van de afdeeling Volkenkunde van het Koloniaal Instituut over 1936*, Amsterdam, 1937
Lijst der Leden Enz, (Kon. Inst. Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederl. Indië), 's-Gravenhage, 1937
Longhurst A. H., *The Story of the Stūpa*, Colombo, 1936
Murti, Y. G. Krishna, *Magnificent Mysore*, Mysore, 1937
Roy, Sarat Chandra and Ramesh Chandra, *The Khārīās* (2 Vols.), Ranchi, 1937
Sahni, Daya Ram, *Archaeological Remains and Excavations at Bairat*, Jaypur State, 1937
Schnitger, F. M., *Hindoe-beelden van Oost-Java*, Vienna, 1937
Do, *Tijgerbeelden in Zuid Sumatra*, Vienna, 1937

ERRATA
(Vol. IV, No. 1)

Page	Line	For	Read
8	f.n. 1	<i>letters</i>	<i>lettre</i>
11	f.n. 2	<i>it les echelles</i>	<i>et des échelles</i>
"	f.n. 3	<i>absolunsant</i>	<i>absolument</i>
12	f.n. 4	<i>pourrai</i>	<i>pourrait</i>
13	36	Add before <i>Ne pas</i> <i>partager</i>	<i>J'avoue</i>
15	5 & 6	<i>saillants en losanges</i>	<i>de pièces à cinq éléments</i>
"	7	<i>l'arrière re-corps</i>	<i>l'arrière-corps</i>
"	Lines 22-26	Suppress the whole passage between the two <i>couronnement de lotus</i>	
"	29	<i>pets tres en</i>	<i>poutre</i>
16	13	<i>ondule</i>	<i>ondulé</i>
19	10	<i>deucine</i>	<i>doucine</i>
"	19	Add a comma before <i>fidèles</i> and <i>sur. sa face</i>	
39	17	<i>Store</i>	<i>Stone</i>
75	10	omit the whole line	
76	35	<i>commenced</i>	<i>recommēnd</i>

